


UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO





3 1761 01530031 2

HANDBOUND
AT THE



UNIVERSITY OF
TORONTO PRESS





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

W. C. C. P. 11.
S. J. Smiles
Louis, Mo.

(28)

8360

I

THE NEW SYSTEM OF THOUGHT

Which Dr. Snider has been engaged upon for some years,
embraces the following works:

I. THE PSYCHOLOGY

1. INTELLECT—PSYCHOLOGY AND PSYCHOSIS . . . \$1.50
2. THE WILL AND ITS WORLD . . . \$1.50
3. FEELING, WITH PROLEGOMENA . . . \$1.50

II. HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

1. ANCIENT EUROPEAN PHILOSOPHY . . . \$1.50
2. MODERN EUROPEAN PHILOSOPHY . . . \$1.50

III. INSTITUTIONS

1. SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS . . . \$1.50
2. THE STATE . . . \$1.50

IV. ÆSTHETIC

1. ARCHITECTURE . . . \$1.50
2. MUSIC (in preparation) . . . \$1.50
3. WORLD'S FAIR STUDIES . . . \$1.50

V. HISTORY

1. THE AMERICAN TEN YEARS' WAR . . . \$1.50
2. THE FATHER OF HISTORY (Herodotus) . . . \$1.50
3. EUROPEAN HISTORY . . . \$1.50

The plan has also in view a psychological treatment of
Biography and of Nature.

THE FATHER
OF
HISTORY

AN ACCOUNT OF
HERODOTUS

BY
DENTON J. SNIDER

ST. LOUIS, MO.
SIGMA PUBLISHING CO.
210 PINE ST.

(For sale by A. C. M'Clurg & Co., Booksellers, Chicago, Ills.)

153370
26 / 11 / 19

D
58
H756



COPYRIGHT BY D. J. SNIDER, 1907

NIXON-JONES PRINTING Co., 215 PINE STREET, ST LOUIS

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION	V-LXXXVII
<i>CLIO</i> BOOK FIRST	1-107
PRELIMINARY	1- 13
THE LYDIAD	13- 62
THE PERSIAD	63- 84
OBSERVATIONS	85-107
<i>EUTERPE</i> BOOK SECOND	108-198
PHYSICAL EGYPT	117-125
SPIRITUAL EGYPT	126-136
HISTORICAL EGYPT	137-167
OBSERVATIONS	168-197

BOOK THIRD	<i>Thalia</i>	198-245
CAMBYSES AND POLYCRATES		202-217
PERSIA AND SAMOS		218-239
OBSERVATIONS		240-245

BOOK FOURTH	Melpomene <i>Melpomene</i>	246-310
SCYTHIA		253-280
LIBYA		281-301

BOOK FIFTH	<i>Terpsichore</i>	311-333
IONIC REVOLT		320-333

BOOK SIXTH	<i>Erato</i>	334-370
PERSIAN vs. GREEK		337-354
MARATHON		355-361

BOOK SEVENTH	<i>Polymnia</i>	371-413
INVASION OF XERXES		373-389
MUSTERING OF THE GREEKS		389-399
THERMOPYLAE		400-410

BOOK EIGHTH	<i>Urania</i>	414-436
MOVEMENTS ON BOTH SIDES		419-424
SALAMIS		424-428

BOOK NINTH	<i>Calliope</i>	437-451
PLATEÆ		438-446
MYCALE		446-449

INTRODUCTION.

The most important fact of History is its birth. If this be accepted, the conclusion lies not far off that the most important historical book is that of the Father of History, ancient Herodotus.

Where, when, and under what circumstances did such a birth take place? History has not always been, man has had to evolve into the same; at a certain epoch the race became historical (or a part of it, the advanced or representative part). Uncounted ages we have to conceive of man as pre-historical, for he cannot count his own years till he has come into a consciousness of History. Then indeed he begins to reckon time backward, not only the passing but

specially the past. In a sense History is always being born, or, as we say often, being made; the act of birth is continually repeated, still the historic consciousness arose at a definite, ascertainable period, and was an event of History, as we think, its most important event—not so much an occurrence in History as the occurrence of History.

Now the time and the place in which to witness and to study this birth of History are found pre-eminently in the book of Herodotus. To be sure a travail of the same sort can be traced elsewhere and elsewhen; but History picturing its own genesis appears first supremely in the Father of History, one of whose deepest strands is just this: to set forth his own historic paternity. Not directly indeed does he make any such claim; we alone, looking back through the ages, can see him in his genetic character, can see him ushering-in the sunrise of History, though before him it had its twilight, yea its dark pre-natal epoch. We call him the Father of History, not because he happens to be the first chronicler of events in Time—that indeed he is not; but because he is primarily creative, he creates or rather re-creates in adequate utterance the risen historic consciousness of the race, particularly of the European (Aryan) race. The sun indeed had to rise before the sunrise could be produced and transmitted;

the historic consciousness had to show its activity ere its deeds could be portrayed.

What is the primal act of this historic consciousness? A city, a people, perchance a race becomes aware of the universal worth of what it has done, aware of its world-historical achievement, for which it seeks naturally a commensurate expression. Such a consciousness we may well conceive the people of Athens to have had after the deed of Marathon. Not a mere local or temporary exploit they felt it to be, but something of universal import for all time, truly a nodal action in the World's History. Where is the man who can set it forth in a form worthy of it and lasting? Here he comes at the call, the one man seemingly capable of this new deed, also heroic in its way and preservative of the heroic deed. He does not sing like Homer, from whom he is nevertheless spiritually descended, as we shall see; he talks prose, yet gives to the same an artistic order which has a decided poetic effect. Not so much the musical word or the rhythmical sentence, but the ordered movement of the parts win the mind as they bring forth the one great totality of History. Herodotus writes not merely a history, but the World's History of his time, and he is the first to grasp and execute such a theme, which has never ceased to be reproduced after him. The Folk-Soul of Hellas, especially of Athens, has become world-historical,

being filled with the Spirit of the Age, or with the World-Spirit, the Genius presiding over History and calling up nations to fulfil its behest. From this point of view we may deem Herodotus the scribe of the World-Spirit for a given period, recording the grand Hellenic deed in the movement of the State toward the end of History, describing one most important stage in the long line of historic evolution.

The Greco-Persian War may well be taken as the period of the birth of History, or at least as the most distinct manifestation of the same, even if there was a long preparation with many prophetic flashes and premonitions. This War was expressly the theme of Herodotus, who stands as the bridge from a pre-historical into an historical world, from a poetical conception of things to prose, not merely in style but in thought. The beauty as well as the significance of his work is, that it represents both sides, and must be grasped doubly; two world-views must be seen in it often separating, often intermingling in a kind of kaleidoscopic dance of many-colored events. On the whole Herodotus moves from the mythical into the historical, but he often drops back from the historical into the mythical, by an easy whirl which is so natural to him that it seems wholly naive. The Greco-Persian War preluded the mighty conflict between two continents and two civilizations, between Europe and Asia; it was

the shock of the World being born into History, whereof came the Herculean infant, whom we call World's History, and who is definitely seen and outlined, though as an infant, in our Herodotus. Before him, History, that is, the World's History was potential, almost though not quite speechless, struggling to get to the upper air, with occasional flashes which leap back into darkness; we may deem it one long pang of parturition, the mighty labor of History being born into Time.

I.

Let us note the historic act of mind, which each of us performs when we study the past. Evidently all History is a going backward to some beginning, if possible to the very beginning, from which point we move through events to the given end, even to our own time, to ourselves. Thus our mental process is cyclical in grasping History; we whirl about to some starting-point in the stream, and then swim down, rounding-out the whole act. And History likewise, in its reality, takes on the same form, which is that of Consciousness itself. It moves in cycles, as an objective Mind in action, thinking and throwing out its thoughts into events of Time, which are always circumnavigating their globe little or large. The interesting fact just

here is that in this cyclical way Herodotus conceives and writes his History. We shall see in detail how he seeks to round-out his masses of occurrences into a line of self-returning rings small and great, till finally all of them form a cyclical entirety. Moreover this procedure is largely instinctive with him, or has such an appearance, though this indeed is his art.

Herodotus starts with the small historical round of events in Asia Minor, involving the struggle between Croesus, the king of Lydia, and the Greek cities of the Anatolian coast. But this little circle of events is deftly unfolded into the larger Persian one, which finally takes up all West-Asia. Then this Persian circle sweeps out of the Orient and seeks to embrace Greece and possibly the Occident, calling forth the conflict which is the theme of this total History of Herodotus, who gives the rounds of events, including both sides, the Orient and Hellas, though the complete separation of these two sides is the grand outcome of the war. The point, however, which we wish to emphasize here is that along with this separation between the two continents, Orient and Occident, appears the definite rise of the historic consciousness; man becomes aware of and calls for History, which records for eternity the eternal worth of the great human deed, like that of Marathon.

The foregoing outer separation, accordingly,

runs parallel to the inner separation which all consciousness involves; the Ego has to divide within itself in order to be conscious at all. But now the historic Ego is definitely born with the birth of History itself, that is, of the World's History. The two are really counterparts and beget each other; there could be no historic Ego without a corresponding World's History, and there could be no World's History without an historic Ego to make it, and to record it, and to understand it when recorded. Mark, we are speaking here of Ego or Self as historic, not merely as psychical; as unfolding in History, and at the same time unfolding History in due correspondence. We repeat then that the separation of Orient and Greece, the ground-theme of Herodotus, is the birth of History as conscious, self-knowing and self-recording, is the real sun-up of the historic Ego of man.

In this complete sense the Oriental man has had no History, not in Egypt, Babylon, China. The Orient lacks just this development of the historic Ego, of which there are many glimmerings, crepuscular flashes, separate events. At most are found in the East some national records, but no World's History. And yet the Oriental stage of History cannot be left out, though it gets its historic light from the West. What a study Europe is now making of the long-past civilizations of the Nile and Euphrates, seek-

ing to co-ordinate them with the World's History, seeking to do for them what they never did or could do for themselves! Persia in Herodotus gets to be world-historical not through itself but through Hellas and its historian, namely our Herodotus. If Persia had won in the great war, it would have snuffed out just this rising historic Ego, and its own deed could never have been recorded except possibly after the fashion of the Behistun inscription, which must be taken as a fair sample of Persian Historiography.

The history proper of Herodotus embraces hardly more than the space of a single human life. It lies between a few years before the capture of Sardes (546 B. C.), and the taking of Sestos after the flight of Xerxes (478 B. C.). In a little more than 68 years is embraced the historic sweep of his work. To be sure he weaves into it what are often named episodes (a bad word for the thing). He himself calls them additions (*prosthe kai*), which, however, are made organic with his total plan, barring a few exceptions. Now in this period of 68 years (let us say) takes place the grand conflict of History, which brings its birth. By means of his episodes he traces all the various streams coming down through the dark past, till they gather into two great colliding heads, Persia and Greece, whose struggle is his book.

The Historian was not contemporaneous with

the period of the War, but lived in the next two generations. His life of 60 years and perhaps more, overlaps at the edge of the beforementioned 68 years directly. Thus he could hear all about the war from living actors, and at the same time look back at it with reflection. He is Pan-Hellenic in spirit, and seeks to give to each people and city their just dues. On this side (as on others) he is like Homer who came from the same general region as Herodotus, whose history grew directly out of the hearts and mouths of the Greek people. ✓

At the same time he is not unfriendly to the Persians. He devotes a large part of his history to the formation of their Empire, which he deems a great act. They, coming originally from the small province of Persia, have by their unique ability conquered, united, and are governing from their capital city all West Asia as far as the Indus. Three vast masses of different kinds of humanity inhabit this enormous territory. First are the mountain people, chiefly Iranians, to which Aryan branch the Persians themselves belong; then are the wholly different nations and civilizations of the two great River-Valleys, the Euphrates and the Nile; finally are the sea-faring cities of the Mediterranean, the Phenician and the Grecian of Asia Minor. All these diverse peoples the Persian consolidated and hurled against continental Greece. After his repulse ✓

from Europe, he ruled this same extensive Empire for nearly 150 years till it was shattered by Alexander at Issus and Gaugamela.

Our historian gives an elaborate account of Persia gradually forming her Empire, which begins with her great national hero Cyrus. Still there are limits to his History. He never penetrated into the Iranian nations beyond the River-Valley of the Euphrates; to him the Indus and its people belong rather to Fableland, to that peculiar Rim with which he surrounds the civilized world. The other omission is more striking. He alludes to the Phenicians, but never interweaves them or their history into his narrative. His omission of the Carthaginians is equally surprising. He leaves out the Semitic contribution to History. Why? Only conjecture can give an uncertain answer.

II.

Something about the life of the writer should be set down in advance of the study of his book. The main interest of that life is the stamp which it bears of the World's History. If there is anything about which all accounts concerning Herodotus are agreed, it is that he was born and passed his earlier years in Asiatic Hellas, that he dwelt at Athens during middle life or a portion of it. and that afterwards he settled in a Greek

colony of Italy, where he is generally supposed to have lived during his later days and to have died there, after revising and completing his work. Here the striking point is that there was an Oriental, an Athenian (Continental or European), and an Occidental Herodotus, and that his life moves through these three stages of the total World's History, as we see this now in our time and from our own country. To be sure, Herodotus was still Hellenic in this life-sweep of his, for the one Hellas had just these same three parts or elements. There was the Oriental Hellas, comprising especially the cities of the Asiatic Coast, and Continental or European Hellas, and Occidental Hellas in Italy and Sicily. Thus the three Hellases in one were a kind of prototype, and indeed the primal historic germ of the World's History in its three stages (Orient, Europe, and Occident) as it lies before us quite fully blossomed out to-day.

But the emphatic thought now is that this universal process of the World's History was stamped upon the very life of Herodotus in its individual process. Not without significance is this, nor is it to our mind a mere fortuitous correspondence. Upon the Father of the World's History is impressed the seal of his paternity. To be sure he is but the voice, the scribe, the recorder; really the World's History fathers him, and imparts to the child the very feature of its

own deepest character. We can say, accordingly, that Herodotus lived a world-historical life, even in its external spatial setting, and foreshadowed in his own personal history the sweep of Universal History.

Along with this outer movement of Herodotus from the East, through Greece, to the West, runs a line of corresponding inner changes which Biography is specially to reveal. Thus it becomes the counterpart of History in the soul of the individual, who always has his subjective tendencies, limitations, peculiarities. These too are present in our Historian and give color to his narrative, and even determine his method of conception and treatment.

The period in which Herodotus lived is fairly definite and ascertainable, but it is difficult to date in detail. It floats freely in a given boundary of time, but the exact year from birth to death can seldom, if ever, be stated. The outlines of his career, yea of his inner development are distinctly visible even if they cannot be sharply timed.

Few are the facts about Herodotus which have come down from antiquity. The real life of the man as well as his spiritual visage we are to catch from his book. We become intimate with him and learn to love him through his written self. He is one of those authors whose personality comes out strongly, though not obtrusively,

in his manner of expression. In part but not wholly the periods of his career are reflected in the divisions of his work. He had his dominantly Oriental time and even mood; then his Greek nature would prevail. These are the two elements which are woven both lengthwise and crosswise, both successively and synchronously, through his work.

These epochs of his life we can discern, though not definitely date. He has a time of travel, of wandering, of gathering materials—a time full of varied experience. This was followed by a time of concentration on the one hand, yet of inner struggle and separation on the other; we may call it his Athenian time, in which he had in a manner to reconstruct his life, his world-view, and therewith his historic consciousness. Finally he quits Athens, colonizes himself in the new West at Thurium in Italy, where he elaborates and finishes his History, going back to his earlier career with its acquisitions through travel and experience, and completely organizing his work, which was previously more or less fragmentary. Hence we find in it many single portions which the young Herodotus wrote with an immediate freshness of vision, but with the limitations of youth. But the great organic totality, the profoundly ordered cosmos of the book is the product of age with its long stretches of thought,

which also require leisure and repose of feeling, as well as maturity of mind.

III.

First, then we have to look at the period of life which we have called the Oriental Herodotus, or the Asiatic epoch of the Historian. This embraces his preparatory education for his work, his apprenticeship. We are to glimpse him in his home, in his boyhood, as traveler and voracious sight-seer. He is supremely the investigator, the keen questioner of the Oracle of History, whose manifold answers throughout the then civilized world we may see him putting down in his note-book, before the pyramids of Egypt, on the walls of Babylon, with the caravan of the desert, amid the wild tribes of the borderland. Then this mass of recalcitrant material must be whipped into order—but that is the task of another period of life.

We are, accordingly, to put under one head that portion of our Historian's life during which he was chiefly occupied with matters Oriental. We must not forget that there were Greeks in Asia and that Herodotus was born an Oriental Greek at the Dorian town of Halicarnassus. The date of his birth is generally placed in 484 B. C., but is sometimes assigned to 469 B. C. The authority for the first date is Pamphila, a female

historian of Nero's time, who is cited by Aulus Gellius; the second date is derived from Eusebius who lived in the reign of Constantine. We shall follow the first with the bulk of authority, though the second has its advantages, and need not be wholly neglected.

What was the environment surrounding the child Herodotus, by which his historic bent may have been fostered? The Greco-Persian War, after lasting some two years was practically ended by the battles of Platea and Mycale in 479 B. C., when our Historian was five years old (or ten it might be). The air which the boy breathed was laden with the great conflict. The battle of Mycale took place not far from his birth-place. The town of Halicarnassus was full of returned sailors who did not fail to talk of Salamis. What had it chiefly to converse about for years afterward except the incidents of the great War, in which its queen Artemisia took a distinguished part on the side of Persia? The youthful Herodotus must have heard the story dozens of times from participators; he grew up in an atmosphere echoing everywhere with the occurrences of that mighty struggle. Certainly, if he had a native inclination to History, here was food enough. Doubtless he heard different versions of the same event, the memory of which led him in riper years to sift his evidence. We may suppose that the eager boy would beg for tales

of the war; thus he has started to *learn by inquiry* (*historein*) and that new science of his, which he calls *Historia* or knowledge gained by asking, has begun its career through Time, even if it will widen its meaning (see the word in the first line of his book). The two chief Greek Historians after Herodotus, Thucydides and Polybius, will to a large extent follow his conception of History, as knowledge gotten through inquiry, since they write mainly, though not wholly, of their own time.

But young Herodotus did not need to confine himself to the recent war. There were men of middle age living in his town who had taken part in the great Ionic revolt (see Book V) which had started some twenty years before and had ended in the capture and destruction of Miletus (494 B. C.), a large city near Halicarnassus. The long line of Greek cities flaming with rebellion is pictured by our Historian with a freshness and distinctness which seem to spring from an immediate personal participation in the events. It is our opinion that the boy heard them told in the ~~market place, in the wine-shop, or at the hearth~~ by those who had seen the actors themselves, notably Histiaeus and Aristagoras. One cannot help thinking that the account of the Ionic revolt was written by the author at an early period and afterwards incorporated in his complete work.

And still further back in the past might the

living informants of our Historian have reached. Very old Halicarnassians could have fought in the wars of Crœsus and Cyrus, both of whom subjected Greek cities of the Anatolian coast. Herodotus says he *knows* who “began doing wrong to the Greeks”—knows of course through inquiry. With this first wrong-doer, who is Crœsus, History starts, the theme of which is the collision between the Greeks and the Orientals. Thus the living word in the ear of that boy was borne back to the opening page of History, and he heard its first Greek note, which has never ceased recording itself from that day to this. ✓

Such are the three layers of antecedent historic struggles of which the young Herodotus could learn by inquiry in his native town. The Persian War, the Ionic Revolt, the Taking of Sardes, to which may be added the Scythian expedition of Darius, though this was more remote in place and interest—all lay within the memory of men still alive and ready to talk about them with Greek volubility. All of them were great crises, or stages in the grand opening conflict of Universal History, the conflict between East and West. As a boy Herodotus gets his theme from his environment, which is in itself world-historical. 21

This we may deem his primal deepest education, which he sucks-in as mother's-milk from the social and institutional order around him. But in his boyhood begins that other sort of educa-

tion, which is to give him the transmitted instrumentalities of culture, whereby he can put into form and hand down to posterity his own spiritual treasures. What branches did he study? The school had been already established; in his book we read of a horrible fatality to a school-house in Chios, by which many youths perished. We conceive that the lad, like many an other, never had much taste for arithmetic; certainly the figures in his work are about the worst part of it, they usually will not tally, the sum total given by him is mostly, though not always, different from the result of the added items. His rather unsympathetic account of Pythagoras may have been influenced by his dislike of the Pythagorean stress upon number. Of geography Herodotus was certainly fond, yea always eager to learn more of it, as we see by his extensive travels; but whether he acquired much of this branch in his Greek school, may be a question. The first map had been already made by Anaximander of Miletus. To the study of language he devoted himself, and he had a good opportunity, as we may catch out of traditions handed down from antiquity. He lived in the after-bloom of the Lyric Poets of Greece, many of whom he cites or alludes to in his book.

But the work which above all others he studied and appropriated was that of Homer. The *Iliad* and *Odyssey* constituted a veritable breviary for

our Historian. In his language there are many Homeric words and turns; then his conception of the Mythus is largely epical. Very deeply he has penetrated the organization of Homer, more deeply than any modern critic probably; also he has not failed to employ it in his own book, whose Homeric structure can often be traced. The chief bond however is that the ground-theme of both Homer and Herodotus is the same; Poet and Historian, each in his own manner, portrays the conflict overarching the Greek world, that between Asia and Europe (see following pp. 9, 11, 14-18, etc.).

There is another item of import which has come down about the Herodotean family: an uncle (or cousin) of the Historian, by the name of Panyasis, was a distinguished epic poet, a resuscitator or more probably an imitator of Homer. He was the author of an epos on Hercules in fourteen books. Think of such a rhapsode in the house reciting his hexameters after the Homeric fashion, and winning the unbounded admiration of all his relatives, among whom was little Herodotus who could hardly help catching the epic lilt and speech. Homer too has the national Pan-Hellenic note, he is not narrowly local or tribal: a trait which Herodotus also possesses in an eminent degree, and which he will show in his coming function of recording the great deed of the Greek race, greater than the

Trojan. So we may conceive the boy to have gotten a home-training for his future work from uncle Panyasis.

Later our Herodotus will go to Athens and there come upon a new kind of poetry—the dramatic, which his friend Sophocles cultivates with great success. This will also deeply influence his History—but let that be told later on; here we are to see that his culture embraces the three kinds of poetry—epic, lyric and dramatic—all of which were evolved in the spiritual development of ancient Hellas, and which still remain our fundamental divisions of the poetic world.

Still Herodotus in spite of all this poetic training and sympathy, will not employ verse as the final form of his expression. Historian he must be, and thus distinct from Homer, from Panyasis, and all the shining host of poets; he will take not the measured speech of the poet, but the prosaist's unfettered flow of words, now demanded and coming into vogue. Pherecydes of Scyros (550 B. C.) is said to have been the first Greek writer of prose, which arose not before but after verse. A curious fact this is, not merely in philology but in psychology: human language turns back (*versus*) ere it goes forward (*prorsus*, *prosa*) continuously. Herodotus is the first great prose-writer of Greece whose book has been preserved as a whole, adjusting his narrative to the forward course of Time itself in

which History has its elemental movement. Poetry measures speech, therewith turning the spirit back upon itself; History breaks loose from this voiced whirling backward of line and strophe, and follows the given stream of events outwardly, but also (in Herodotus) shows them inwardly moving in cycles. From this point of view we can say that our Historian has preserved the inner poetic soul of man's heroic deeds, even if he rejects their formal outer vesture of verse.

The education at home being fairly completed, Herodotus, now a young man, takes the next important step in his career, which is to become a traveler. Already (we may suppose) he has seen the neighboring cities along the coast of Asia Minor, and has visited the adjacent islands. Possibly he has taken a flying trip to Athens, then the central city of the Greek world. With Samos he must have had some special connection; possibly he has been entertained by his namesake in Chios, Herodotus son of Basileides, a supposed relative though an Ionian, whom our Historian singles out for special mention from seven otherwise nameless persons on an embassy (Book VIII, 132). The aspiring young fellow thus gets the desire to move outward from the Greek center to periphery, and to see with his own eyes the extremes of the known or civilized world, as it appeared about the middle of the fifth century B. C.

In regard to the travels of Herodotus, we are quite in the dark about the order of the countries visited, the length of his stay in each, his means of transport, his companions, his hardships, his expenses. The personal side, so prominent in the modern book of travels, he has quite eliminated in transforming his notes into History. The knowledge of the object he gives often along with its historic genesis. What is present he tells, but it cannot be understood apart from its past, which is also to be recounted. So he learns by inquiry how these marvelous things before him got to be, and then sets down the whole, kneading it together into his form of expression. Thus the traveler will metamorphose himself into the historian. But first he has to be the traveler, the simple chronicler, and the geographer, gathering his materials very slightly out of books, though these already existed and must have furnished some points, especially his chief purpose, which was a book.

✓ In a general way the journeys of Herodotus can be conceived as extending from Hellas or perchance from Halicarnassus as a center, toward the four quarters of his environing world. To the East, South, North, and probably West he travels as far as he can, till he comes to the Rim which separates civilized antiquity from barbarous. This Rim is not easy to draw to the exact line, still it is a very real thing to Herodo-

tus, and he marks it on all sides in his book. Beyond it he does not travel, though we may see him peering across it with a shy curiosity and beholding all sorts of marvels. Indeed over the Rim lies the land of wonders, such as India, Ethiopia, Scythia, which can only be described by the miracles of the fairy-tale. But inside the Rim is the historic world, especially Persia and Hellas; between these Powers is the grand conflict of History, to describe which is just the function of our Historian.

One may conjecture that his first long trip may have been eastward, to Babylon, the colossal city of the Orient, and to Susa, the capital of Persia, where he might have had some business, as he was ostensibly a Persian subject. On the whole this was an easy journey to take, since he had only to ride along the excellent road made by Darius and supplied with caravanseries at convenient stopping-places. The limit of this journey to the East was the valley of the Euphrates, for Herodotus never penetrated the mountains of Persia proper, the original seat of the Persians, and he never saw their famous cities, Persepolis and Pasargadæ. The Indus lay far beyond his horizon, and also the vast stretch of territory inhabited by the Aryans from Bactria to Persia—a territory which Alexander will traverse in his later conquests. The huge fluvial cities, Nineveh and Babylon, with their long antecedent

History won the permanent interest of the budding Historian, though his object was to trace the rise of the Persian empire from its first beginning till it had consolidated all the peoples of West-Asia into a mighty mass, which was to be hurled against the little Greek City-State in vain.

✓ The journey to Egypt was a capital event in the life of Herodotus, though the date of it is uncertain. The plausible conjecture has been made that he was there during the revolt of Inaros from the Persian king (460-55 B. C.), when "the Athenians controlled the country" according to Thucyclides. But at any time he would have found many Greeks in Egypt, inasmuch as for two centuries, since the age of Psammetichus, they had been located in the valley of the Nile. Our traveler naturally went first to the Greek town Naucratis founded by Amasis, with its native speech, customs, wine-shops, especially with its licensed guild of interpreters, half-breeds as Herodotus has told their story. What did he get from Egypt, from its pyramids, from its colossal works, from its long lapse of centuries? That second Book of his (on Egypt) has to our mind a peculiar style and coloring; the clear Greek outline is seen evanishing into an uncertain twilight of shapes. At any rate the Historian here reaches quite back to the beginning of History, to the first evidenced start

of human civilization. Now Herodotus is destined to make a new historic beginning, very different from that old Egyptian one; he will portray the start of European History in its conflict with the Orient, though the latter seems to have its far-off primordial start in Egypt. Certainly Herodotus was thrown back to the remotest reach of his science during his trip in the Valley of the Nile. Thus it had its bearing upon his life-task, which was to show the great historic transition from the East to the West (More about Herodotus in Egypt on following pp. 179-85).

Along the Southern Rim of his travels, Herodotus sees the Greek colonies Cyrene and Barke, with quite a little stretch of Northern Africa embracing what seems to be a caravan route in the Libyan desert. Beyond this Rim again he places unnatural things, wonders recounted in fabulous tales. As a counterpart of this Southern border, the North has also its Rim with the corresponding marvels (in Book IV). It is likely that our traveler did not fail to pay a visit to the Greek world in the West, in Italy and Sicily, during his first period, and note there also the Rim of Barbary. But properly that Western world belongs to his later life, in which it will receive some notice, from his having gone to Italy as a colonist. Thus on four sides, with Greece as a center, he has delimited his environ-

ing earth, which he conceives as embraced in a kind of border or Rim not easily passible, and perilous at least for the ordinary man.

Such we may deem the itinerary of Herodotus in his attempt to make the round of the known territory of antiquity. In every direction he has pushed to the belt which surrounds the civilized nations, and separates them from the uncivilized and even unhuman. This we have called the Rim of Barbary, which civilization is to transcend step by step through all coming History till our own time, which likewise has its borderland of savagery. It is for us one of the merits of the Father of History that he draws this peripheral line with such distinctness, and thus in his way marks out the problem of civilization, of course unconsciously. After his time we shall see Rome extending this Rim, and Charlemagne pushes it out still farther, beyond the old limit in the North.

Finally the traveler returns home from his distant journeyings. This is the time when a political adventure is ascribed to him. The tyrant Lygdamis who has slain his uncle Panyasis, forces him to flee from Halicarnassus; but he returns with help and drives out the tyrant. This story is first told by Suidas, a late and poor authority; the result is that it has been generally discredited by scholars. It may be deemed, however, a tribute to the popularity of Herodotus

that some Greek story-teller has put into his career an heroic deed, and made him a tyrant-expeller or a tyrant-slayer. This was a favorite theme of Greek romance, as we see by the tale of Harmodius and Aristogiton and of many others. On the whole, however, the heroism of Herodotus lay in a different field, which is amply illustrated by what we read of him in his book.

The year of his return to his native city can not be told exactly, still its place in his life is reasonably fixed. His first apprenticeship to History he has faithfully served; he has penetrated, as far as was then possible, to the remote past of the early civilizations found in the River Valleys of the Nile and Euphrates. The later rise of the great Oriental Empires in Media and then in Persia he has traced. This knowledge is somehow to be connected and organized with the historic facts of the Greco-Persian wars, about which he had heard in his younger days. Very different are the two sets of occurrences, but they have a unity, they show one grand movement of History, which culminates in the mighty blow which separates Orient and Occident. Now the pivotal question with Herodotus at this time must have been, Can I portray this unity? Can I organize these diverse materials into a book which is itself a unity? We can imagine him re-reading his *Odyssey* which is also a return home (*nostos*) and delving into

its subtle structure, in order that he too may be a builder of the mighty Deed in words. Many hints he gets from that Homeric source, but he concludes that he cannot sing his theme in the present age—which by the way was the mistake of uncle Panyasis, whose work has totally perished. He must have felt that the creative period of the old Epos has gone, and that the time for a new literary expression, that of History, has come.

Many signs of this new form of utterance, not epical, not lyrical, not even poetic, have shown themselves in the Greek cities along the coast of Asia Minor, and in the adjacent islands. Particularly at Miletus, then lying in ruins from the Persian conquest, but once the most flourishing city, both commercially and intellectually, of the whole Hellenic stock, History had already put forth its earliest buds in Hecataeus and Dionysius. Quite a list of the names of these pre-Herodotean historians have come down to us, with some few fragments of their works. Charon of Lampsacus, Hellanicus of Lesbos and Xanthus of Sardes are perhaps the best known of these eclipsed lights; we learn that Milesian Dionysius had composed a History of Persia before Herodotus. In general that whole Greco-Asiatic border was already flowering with History, which was verily the new expression of the time. Indeed we hear of an historian in the

West, Hippys of Rhegion, who gave an account of the Greek colonization of Sicily and Italy.

Here we should note a striking correspondence. At Miletus Philosophy had already begun in Thales, who was also a forerunner in Science. Not in central or continental Hellas does Greek culture send forth its first bloom, but in the colonial borderland, especially that of Asia Minor. From this periphery Art, Science, Philosophy, and History also, will pass to the European mother-country, concentrating finally at Athens, which will unfold them to their highest ancient maturity. Greek culture, originating on the circumference of the Hellenic world, is first centripetal, and then having perfected itself to its supreme manifestations in one City-State, becomes centrifugal, raying forth through the Macedonian and Roman Empires.

Now Herodotus is living at the time when the great centripetal movement of Greek culture from the Asiatic colonial borderland takes place. There is no doubt that this flight of the free Greek Spirit evolving itself into all the higher disciplines, was caused by the curse of Persian domination. The autonomous Hellenic City-State was the institutional source as well as the protecting environment of the supreme forms of Greek civilization. Of course, in Asia Minor the rule of the Persian extinguished this all-sided development of the Hellenic Folk-Soul. Hence a

✓ vast spiritual migration of the whole body of the Arts and Sciences began to flow toward Athens, the completely free City-State, which had freed itself and the continental City-States of Greece from the smothering domination of the Oriental. Moreover Athens had won a large political authority after the war with Persia, and was the real capital of the total Hellas.

Our present interest is that Herodotus joins this migration, has to join it in order to complete that new discipline of his, not merely a History but the World's History. It would seem that the tyrant Lygdamis, under Persian authority still ruled in his city, which fact was deeply discordant with his theme. He had to seek an harmonious institutional environment if he would put the right spirit into his work.

We may likewise infer that the returned traveler found the situation at home no longer pleasant. He could hardly settle down into the narrow routine of a little household and of a little town, after having expanded his life through the known world, even to the Rim of Barbary. His conflict with the tyrant Lygdamis may be mythical, still there was an inner conflict and probably a hard one. Like every traveler, ancient or modern who returns home after a long absence, he finds his place filled, things have gone on without him and do not need him; he is a superfluity. Then what could he do with his large acquisitions of

knowledge in that small corner of Halicarnassus, quite out of the way of the world's movement? And could he make there the grand transition of his life from the traveler to the historian? Not at all; so forth he must go. But whither? To the intellectual center of the Greek world.

IV.

It is not known in what year Herodotus began his permanent Athenian residence. In our opinion the peace of Callias (450-449 B.C.) represents about the time when he transferred his abode to Athens. There is good reason for thinking that this event had great significance in the life of Herodotus. He makes an allusion to the embassy of Callias and its presence at the court of the Persian King Artaxerxes (VII, 151), though the occurrence lies far outside of the scope of his work. The grand fact about this embassy is that it established peace between Greece or Athens specially and Persia, and thus was the acknowledged conclusion of the long Greco-Persian conflict, which had really lasted from the time of Cyrus who had subjugated the Greek cities of Asia Minor. These cities were now recognized as autonomous by the Persian king, and enrolled as allies of the Athenian Confederacy. Among them was doubtless, the native city of our Historian, Halicarnassus. By the treaty no war-ship of

Persia was permitted in the waters of the Aegæan, which thus became practically an Athenian sea, and the whole Asiatic coast along this sea was turned toward Athens as its center of defense and of authority. Its people changed their political look from the East to the West. We shall find the same change in Herodotus, who now personally and spiritually moves out of Asia into Europe—a transition reflected deeply in his book.

Nor are we to forget the Persian advantages granted by the peace of Callias. Athens pledged herself to keep out of Egypt, to quit Cyprus, in fine to leave Persia alone in her assigned bounds. This was a very important step in the policy of Athens, who on account of her victories over the Persians had begun to dream of Oriental conquest. Such a policy had been upheld by Cimon, but he died and disasters came, especially the terrible blow in Egypt. Then Pericles took the helm of State, and recalled Athens from her schemes of territorial conquest both in the East and in Hellas, really recalled her to her true destiny. Pericles foresaw the coming Peloponnesian War, and proposed to be ready for it through the one possible way, Athenian naval supremacy. But he also had an internal policy of developing his city, which thereby entered upon what is known as the Periclean age, famous for its Art, Science, Poetry and Philosophy—

spiritually the grandest creative epoch in the World's History.

Now we are to see Herodotus plunged as it were headforemost into this Athenian whirlpool of intellectual activity. He was then somewhere about thirty-five to forty years old. He brought extensive notes of his travels in the East, essentially the Oriental part of his work, together with his explorations in the North and in the South. He has been hitherto the wanderer, the sight-seer, the diligent reporter. But now at Athens he is to become the Historian and is to transform his disjointed observations into an organic History. The supreme interest at present is to trace the influences which produced or helped to produce this transformation.

First of all we are to note that in the Athenian capital Herodotus came upon a new line of historic events, those of continental Greece and particularly those of Athens. Some forty years before his arrival had occurred the victory of Marathon, and he could converse with many men still living who had been in that battle. Greater yet was the number of Athenian survivors of the war with Xerxes, ten years after Marathon. Certainly here was a fine opportunity for Herodotus to "learn by inquiry." Athens was the center of the victorious repulse of Persia, and many of the victors were still on hand to give their experience. The Historian could easily

reach the famous battle-fields, see their monuments and read their inscriptions. Marathon was distant not more than a good day's walk; Plataea was but a few hours further, while the city overlooked Salamis.

✓ The chief fact of the stay at Athens, however, was that the Historian had to be transformed, and then he could transform or rather create his History. He must see the workings of the democracy, which had done the heroic deeds of the desperate war, and he must become sympathetic with it; this sympathy he shows repeatedly throughout his work. In the Orient he had known only absolute monarchies, he was born a Persian subject; moreover he was a Dorian by birth and probably of an aristocratic family. Evidently he had to get over quite a stock of prejudices ere he could feel himself a congenial Athenian democrat. Yet this he seems to have done. Having become harmonious with the institutional world around him, he is ready to give its History with the sympathy and admiration which its valorous action deserves. Detractors have indeed charged him with excessive partiality for Athens, but the impression abides that he was not more partial to her than History itself or than the World-Spirit.

In this Athenian school Herodotus must have learned other things necessary for his vocation. Speeches indeed he could find in Homer; but


public oratory applied to historic events he could only witness in the Assembly of the People. He must have often seen and heard Pericles as well as opposing orators; thus he could get acquainted with the spirit of Athens and learn much of her past history in the allusions of the speakers. From Plutarch is derived the statement that he knew the poet Sophocles, who addressed to him personally a poem. Herodotus was at Athens during the bloom of Tragic Poetry and its influence upon him cannot be doubted. It may be said that he shows prevailingly a tragic view of the world, similar to that of the great Athenian tragedians. He could have been present at the first representation of *Antigone*, which contains a passage very similar to one in his History (III, 119). The story of Adrastus has decidedly a tragic pathos of the fateful Athenian sort (I, 35-45). In fact the tragic Nemesis which overshadows the whole work, was gotten by the Historian from the Athenian consciousness of the time, in whose greatest poetic conceptions it finds expression.

The Periclean age is noted for its dominant architectonic power: it produced the Parthenon and the Propylæa, of their kind the supreme edifices of the world. But this marvelous constructive character is found not merely in architecture, it belongs to other spiritual domains, to Literature and Philosophy, and gives the chief

element of style to Classic Art. The dramas of Sophocles owe much of their beauty and power to their very simple yet very subtle structure. Plato is a builder in his way quite as much as Ictinus, the architect of the Parthenon, in whose pediments Phidias gives the greatest example of architectural sculpture. Athens having built her empire, became a builder at home, and all her spiritual products have this architectonic element. Now we are to grasp fully the relation of this phase of Athenian development to our Historian, we are to trace its effect upon his genius. Herodotus became a builder too, a spiritual builder, and nobody can get to the heart of his work without penetrating and fully conceiving, yea formulating the constructive principle of it in the parts and in the whole. The profoundly artistic element of Periclean Athens he studied and appropriated till it became a portion of his spiritual nature, and not only transformed but transfigured his book, which is in the deepest sense a work of art. The student is, therefore, to rebuild in his own soul the grand historic edifice of Herodotus, as unique, as epoch-making, and we hold, as beautiful in its way as the Parthenon. Indeed both these structures, so we may call them, rise up contemporaneously from the same great movement of the city and the age.

There was another spiritual current for which the time of Pericles has become famous: the

philosophic. It is highly probable that our historian may have seen a strange personage, barefooted and snub-nosed, standing on the street-corners or shuffling through the market-place, in order to converse with the people upon the topics of the day, though in a new and peculiar manner, by question and answer. But in this process he employed an inner method of his own, which had the strange power of burning up all mere caprices, opinions, individual views, and of throwing the stress upon the creative thought of the object, the true concept of it, that which was universal. Herodotus, during his prolonged residence at Athens could hardly help meeting Socrates, and learning from him something by inquiry, since the historian was fully as inquisitive as the philosopher. We shall not try to reproduce their dialogue (after the fashion of Landor), only saying that our historian, though not naturally philosophic, has caught some notion of that elusive universal element and has in his way put it into his History. Indeed Athens has this universal element in all her deeds and words at this time, for have these not lived through Space and down Time? Her utterance has shown itself universal in Literature, Art, and Philosophy, being really for all ages and all countries. In this universality of Athens Herodotus has participated. Especially has he celebrated Athenian Solon as a philosopher, having put into his



mouth the world-view which is distinctively Herodotean in a dialogue with Cræsus (I. 29-33). This dialogic form may have been caught up from Socrates (though not necessarily) but its full artistic development we find somewhat later in Plato. The doctrine of *Nemesis*, who seems to hover between a personal divinity and a philosophic abstraction, we consider also to have been a growth which the historian chiefly obtained from contemporary Athens. To our way of looking, it contains a strand which connects it with the *Nous* of the philosopher *Anaxagoras*, who was the friend of Pericles, and who lived at Athens during the entire stay of Herodotus. Following the example of the great statesman, the cultivated Athenian studied philosophy, and supplanted *Zeus* with *Nous*. The result was that religion entered Athenian politics and the enemies of Pericles preferred a charge of impiety against Anaxagoras, who was compelled to leave the city. It is to this source that we are inclined to trace the thread of free-thinking which our historian shows woven through his religiosity. He has a tinge of what may be called the Athenian *Aufklärung*, a skeptical turn which often curiously colors his dominant credulity.

But there is one thing which Herodotus does not seem to have fully acquired at Athens: the complete mastery of the Attic dialect. It remains a matter of uncertain conjecture why our his-

torian did not employ Athenian speech for the composition of his History. What he heard around him and what he conversed in for many years, what had already become the vehicle of the highest poetic and literary expression, he for some reason rejected. We can understand why he, though a Dorian by birth rejected the Doric. But why he should prefer a form of the Asiatic Ionic, probably the Samian, to the Athenian Ionic, is far more of a problem. Ultimately we have to think that he took the dialect most natural to him, and we know from his History that he must have had some very intimate and lasting relations with the island of Samos (See Book III, *passim* and the following commentary pp. 243-5). This was in his youth when language weaves itself into the fibre of the mind. He may have believed, too, that the largest constituency for his book would be the Ionians of the Asiatic coast, with their numerous cities and colonies. It is probable that Ionic was the *lingua franca* for commercial intercourse with the Mediterranean peoples of the East. Thus his History might reach beyond Greece. But the chief reason probably was that he never felt himself quite master of the niceties of Attic style, he always remained too much of a provincial, not having reached Athens before middle life when speech is no longer fluid in the soul but has taken its fixed form. Undoubtedly

the dialect is more naive and unreflective than the cultivated tongue, and we feel a certain suitability of the vehicle to the manner and character of Herodotus. He is far more of a spontaneous artist than a thinker, in spite of his philosophizing.

In this connection another question throbs up: How does it come that Athens herself, so full of all sorts of artistic expression, never produced the historian of her greatest deeds? It is Herodotus, an Asiatic Greek, a Dorian of Halicarnassus, who has transmitted to all time the account of Marathon, Salamis, Platæa, the supreme glories, as far as heroic action of a single community is concerned, of Athens, of Greece, if not of the entire World's History. It would seem that only an outsider, sympathetic and far-traveled, who knew both Persia and Greece, and in a way was of both, who had in him the Oriental as well as the Hellenic strains, could make the great historic synthesis required for recording adequately the Greco-Persian War. Athens was too one-sided to portray such a conflict, even if the World-Spirit breathed upon her in doing the deed. Politically she was after all merely an Ionic City-State, and one among many of the kind. To be sure, she will later build an empire of her own, but that lies not in the theme of Herodotus. A transplanted Oriental Greek embraces the three elemental conditions:

he must be an Oriental; he must be a Greek—we might say a Doric Greek, for the Dorians took a strong part in the War, and even were (as Spartans) the leaders highest in command; he must finally be an Athenian, though an adopted one, for nowhere except at Athens could he drink of that World-Spirit, which was the overmastering presence in the struggle. Nowhere else could he find the true information about Themistocles the most heroic character which the War brought to the surface. The Athenian, great in art, poetry, philosophy, forms of uttering what is universal, could not write his own history as universal, but had to find a man who spanned all the colliding elements of the age. Politically Athens could not be universal, could not even be national.

But when the City-States of Greece began to fly asunder and assail one another, then Herodotus turns away—for he lived to see the Peloponnesian War—and another and very different hand, though an Athenian one, grasps the pen of History. Thucydides, born in Attica, can record the long and bitter conflict of his city with other Greek cities; his theme is not that of united Hellas against the invading Orient, but of separated Hellas against itself. He is the product of a divisive, analytic, self-undoing world, to which his mind and his style correspond. Intellectually the two great Historians are very different, and

represent different tendencies. Historically Herodotus is Pan-Hellenic, while Thucydides is Athenian, though impartial and fair to all sides. Hence the latter must write in the dialect of his City-State, into whose institutional world he is so decidedly cast.

✓ Herodotus has, therefore, to pass through the Athenian spirit in order to get the universality of Athens, and to apply it to History—which strangely no gifted son of that city, so prolific of genius in other fields, seems able to do. It is through this baptism that History itself becomes universal, becomes the World's History. Otherwise Herodotus would have remained merely a collector of facts, a geographer, ethnographer, at most a local historian, giving an account of this or that country during a certain time. ✓ He would never have risen beyond the numerous incipient historians of the Asiatic border, like Hecatæus, Dionysius, Hellanicus and the rest. But his true destiny is to resume them all essentially in his own work, to organize into unity their fragments, to universalize that which is indeed only particular. As he rendered them complete, who were partial and incomplete, he rendered them unnecessary. Time, not needing them for its record, has let them drop quite into the sea of oblivion, ↓

with hardly more than their names still afloat tied to a few fragments in some cases.

In one thing he did not follow the Athenians, who had substantially eliminated woman from their History, in contrast with the Orient and even with the mythical aforesaid of Hellas. Herodotus seems to have had a fondness for heroines, who retained in his mind their legendary prominence. Queen Tomyris, glutting the dead Cyrus with blood, shows the tragic intensity of Medea. But his favorite evidently is Artemisia, queen of his own native Halicarnassus, who actually fought at Salamis on the Persian side and ran down and sank a ship in her way, as she was fleeing from capture, whereby she won the notice of Xerxes. The Athenians tried to make her a prisoner, "for they thought it an awful thing for a woman to dare make war upon Athens." So they set a prize for her capture, which she deftly eluded. In that word *awful* (*deinon*) one may still hear Herodotus bantering his Athenian audience with a sly thrust of sarcastic humor (VIII, 93). He glorifies her as a kind of Amazonian Queen of old Greek legend, who had a second time invaded their country. For the mythical Amazons made an expedition against Attica and laid it waste—an instance which the Athenians themselves cite in their dispute with the Tegeans before the battle of Plataea (IX, 27). But one queries about Arte-

misia: What emancipated woman of to-day would think of equaling her by taking command of an army in the field or of a squadron of ships in a sea-fight? Surely she is still far ahead of our age on one line of progress.

In a degree, therefore, Herodotus restores the woman of the Greek Mythos to Greek History, going out of his way somewhat to do it, one thinks. In this regard he again stands in striking contrast to Thucydides, who is narrowly an Athenian of the historic era in respect to women, not even mentioning *Aspasia* nor any other prominent woman. The mythical heroine has wholly vanished from his Hellenic world.

But Greek culture having migrated to Athens, and undergone its transformation there, must migrate out of Athens, bearing the impress of her universality. Again our Historian plunges into the stream, and is now borne outwards, yet not back to the Orient but forward to the Occident. Into, through, and out of the Athenian discipline he passes, marking the main epochs of his life.

V.

It is not doubted that Herodotus made a change of abode and became a citizen or perchance a colonist of Thurium, a new city founded in Italy upon the site of Sybaris (destroyed in 510 B. C., by the neighboring city of Crotona).

The time when Herodotus is supposed to have quit Athens for his new home in the West is variously given; let us say 443 B. C., with good authorities (Clinton and Rawlinson). This would be some six years after the peace of Callias; about the time of that peace Herodotus appeared at Athens as a permanent resident. But it is very doubtful if our Historian remained continuously at Thurium. He probably received his allotment of land and his right of citizenship. There are passages in his book which indicate that he must have been present at Athens repeatedly after the given date of his settlement at Thurium. He did not need to give up wholly the central city for the colony, which turned out a very turbulent, seditious community.

It is, however, a significant fact in the life of Herodotus, that he becomes the Occidental Greek after his Oriental and Athenian epochs. Thus he spans the three chief divisions of the Hellenic world, yea of all future History down to the present. Still from his book we may gather that he never fully identified himself with the Hellenic Occident, and of course he showed no indication of the coming Italy and Rome. He was perchance too old, and he was too bent upon setting forth the one great conflict, that between Persia and Greece, upon which in his time lay the stress of the World's History.

It has been handed down that he wrought out

and completed his History at Thurium. The materials which he had gathered at Athens and in the Orient had to be put into artistic shape, being kneaded over from a great variety of notes, memories, investigations of many kinds during an entire life. Some parts must have been written out and possibly published before others or the whole. Keen critical eyes have claimed that they have seen the signs of several different editions in his work. There are passages which seem to lack the author's final revision. There are possibly one or two maladjustments or even displacements; still the whole has come down to us in a remarkably complete state. We see the finishing hand of the artist in the grand totality as well as in its larger and smaller details. In this respect we are acquainted with no historical work in existence to be compared with it. The modern historian is the victim of Time, and is swept along in mere temporal succession. Undoubtedly the setting of History is Time, but watch what the old Father did with his child. In moving forward it is also to reveal the process, the return upon itself; History is not simply a line of events streaming outward to infinity, not simply a line starting here and cut off there, even if it has a beginning and an end. His entire work is the advance and the recoil of the Orient back upon itself, in which recoil the great historic separation takes place—the separation of

the Orient from Europe. That is his theme, the most important and deepest of History. Also it is universal, embracing both sides, Asiatic and European. Here we can see that Herodotus has written a World's History, while Thucydides is Hellenic, and not wholly that, for he is confined essentially to the civilized City-State of Greece and its conflicts. Herodotus shows far more interest in and appreciation of tribal Greece and the barbarous world, which, though in themselves unhistoric, will assert more and more a place in the totality of History.

No biography of the Historian can neglect the transmitted fact that he gave readings from his work at Athens, and at various other cities of Greece. Eusebius states that the Public Assembly of the city decreed him a reward for History, some of which he had read before the people. Then he must have imparted his work privately to many persons. As an author, he could not help that. Indeed he must have tested his account of Marathon upon many Marathonian soldiers, not to speak of the thousands still living who had taken part in Salamis and Plataea. His narrative, as we read it to-day, has the flavor, the interest, perchance somewhat of the bias which comes of being taken directly from the lips of the Athenian combatants. He must have heard in the streets, at the banquet, and in the market-place, the famous battles fought over

again and again, with keen running comments upon the Spartans, their own Athenian leaders, and the Persian enemy. We can all judge of the situation by our American experience. Herodotus arrived in Athens about thirty years after the war with Persia. In every hamlet and farmhouse of our land, North and South, the soldier who was present is still ready to give his account of battles and his opinion of the generals on both sides. Upon such an ever-bubbling fountain of History our eager reporter came, and of course began to take notes, sift statements and eliminate contradictions, seeking to get at the truth. Who does not recognize the difference in style and treatment between the first half and the second half of his work? So striking is this difference that the one half may be called Oriental, the other Hellenic. The latter chiefly springs from his stay at Athens, and takes color and conception largely from the talk of her soldiers and sailors.

Of course Herodotus found a gratified audience at Athens, since his work was in some of its chief aspects an Athenian reflection. And it had to be, if it were truly world-historical. For there can be no doubt that the Genius of Universal History, otherwise called the World-Spirit, was brooding over the Attic city during that time, and bringing forth the pivotal events of the age. Some such presence our Historian

must have felt and sought to catch, harnessing it in his narrative, where we may still recognize it thousands of years later. Of course he read extracts from his work in order to hear the reverberations of the Athenian Folk-Soul to his words, and to re-echo its voice, filled as it was with the mighty destiny of the time which he was to show forth in his History. In some of his readings he may have met the young Thucydides, though tradition has placed their meeting at Olympia.

It is reported that he went to other Greek cities, Thebes and Corinth for instance, and to have held readings. If he did actually go to Thebes, he may have given an extract from his account of Egypt, with which that city claimed some mythical connection through its Egyptian namesake. He hardly recited to the Thebans their conduct at Plataea and the historic siege of their city by the assembled Greeks, a striking counterpart of its famous mythical sieges. If he read at Corinth, he probably did not select the unpatriotic part which its admiral played before the battle of Salamis. He may have recited there the speech of the Corinthian Sosicles (V. 92) against tyrants. Most welcome would he be in the little town of Plataea, whose people shared with Athens the glory of Marathon, and which he must have repeatedly visited for the sake of the neighboring battle-field and its monuments.

Where Herodotus died is not certain; there are three different reports coming down from ancient times. Most probable is the statement of Suidas that he ended his days at Thurium, and was buried in the market-place. The time of his death is also unsettled. One improbable report makes him outlast the Peloponnesian War ten years, and carries his age up into the nineties. We are inclined to think (with Grote, Rawlinson and others) that he never lived to see the Athenian expedition to Sicily (415 B. C.), which was the attempt of Athens to get possession of Occidental Hellas. The transfer of Athenian ambition from the East to the West would have forced from him some interpolation even more emphatic than the peace of Callias.

We have to infer that he was alive at the death of Artaxerxes who died in 425 B. C.; since he alludes to that Persian king's reign as past. Several years of the Peloponnesian War he lived through; he speaks of the evils which had befallen Greece not only from the Persians, but from the Greek leaders themselves (men and cities) warring with one another "for the supremacy" (VI, 98). From such a spectacle he turns away his eyes, leaving its record to a different Historian, Thucydides, whose theme is the inner self-undoing and dissolution of the Greek City-State, whereas the theme of Herodotus is its triumph over the Orient, which was indeed its culminating act.

VI

We are next to inquire about the institutional world which Herodotus portrays, and of which he is the great historical protagonist. Primarily the struggle between Asia and Greece is a political one, and turns upon the form of government under which man is to live. The Orient had its way of authority, its kind of State, born of its consciousness and adapted to its needs. But a new governmental form had sprung up among the Greeks, and manifested its first flowering along the coast of Asia Minor. The same political drift, however, was observable throughout all Hellas, which was engaged in building and bringing to completion the Hellenic City-State—a unique phenomenon in the World's History, and the herald of coming Europe.

The political History of Greece, then, pivots upon the City-State as autonomous, exclusive, self-sufficing and self-contained. The entire Greek Nation has the tendency to break up into communal atoms, each of which longs to have its own law and life within itself, and to be connected as little as possible with its neighbors. Such is the fundamental fact of the Hellenic world, particularly in contrast with the Orient, which unites, even if externally, cities, peoples, and races, solidifying them at least on the surface. This Oriental massification of humanity is shivered by

Greece into its individual constituents, both as to persons and institutions, each of which begins to unfold within itself and to insist upon its own separate career. The man and the community now get possession of themselves, and flower forth with an excellence which still remains epoch-making in the World's History. Greece starts to individualizing itself, and with it Europe also, and the process will continue through European civilization till the present. The colossal overwhelming Orient, as we see it in the Persian Empire, meets the small City-State of Athens at Marathon, and is whirled back upon itself with a mightiness and completeness which means the dawn of a new institutional order.

At the same time the drawback must be acknowledged: the Greek defect of associative power. Such stress is put upon the individual community that it cannot combine with other communities for a great national purpose, or can combine but partially and temporarily and with great difficulty. The Greek people has no political unity till this be forced upon it from the outside, first by Macedonia and then by Rome.

With Greece then, the second great stage of Universal History begins, the European, whose deepest character is indicated by the foregoing fact. Greece in separating from Asia, separates within itself, takes up separation into its national character, and remains separated and self-

separated to the end of its political existence. Now the manifestation of this trait is seen in the multiplicity of autonomous City-States whose aggregate is properly Hellas. Hence we call it a Polyarchy, being made up of many separate governments, like Europe of to-day. Hellas is accordingly, a Polyarchy of autonomous City-States, and will show, in its History the rise, bloom, and decline of a People having such a political organization. Thus it takes its place in the world-historical movement of the European State, being the first in line, the beautiful prelude of the whole historic drama of the Occident.

Still we must remark that the Greek mind, with all its bent toward separation, held within itself an undercurrent of longing for unity. Thus it had a common religion, common centers of worship like Delphi, common festivals and games like the Olympian. In fact the very thing which originally separated the Greeks, the hate of the Orient, finally united them in repelling the Persian, and also in the expedition against Troy, which even if mythical, shows the spirit of the age. Then there was the common speech, the common mythus, and the common poetry of Homer. And there may be noted a deeper connection which, though unconscious, will at last burst up to the surface in action. That Greek speech, and also that Greek mythus, as we now know. had their roots far back in Asiatic lands,

to which Alexander will penetrate as if driven by the deepest instinct of his Aryan race to overcome its separation.

How this undercurrent of Greek aspiration for national unity, though unable to make itself institutional in a State during its free historic period, will realize itself to a degree in Macedon and Rome, but most adequately in Byzantium, is not to be set forth in this place. But at the time of Herodotus, the Greek conception of freedom stands in the way. That freedom finds itself possible only in the limited autonomous City-State, which being small and easily conquerable, is destined soon to be snuffed out. It is true that with Greece freedom may be said to have been born into History, which is to show more and more complete forms of its realization in the unfolding of political institutions. Greece indeed shows the earliest, perchance the most beautiful, yet the most fragile flower of freedom which has ever bloomed in time. Such was the political limitation of the Greek; he could create no great nation to safeguard that free individuality of his, but only a little City-State, which showed almost no power of combining with other City-States for its own security.

Now it is this political institution whose struggle with its supreme foe, the Orient, our Historian records. Long and doubtful it was; indeed on the coast of Asia Minor the Greek

City-State could not maintain itself. But its world-historical triumph took place in European Hellas, notably through Athens, and that triumph essentially means the historic birth of Europe, which has now asserted and vindicated its own political world, and henceforth is to have its own History.

Greece has, accordingly, developed and upheld that form of human association which we call the City-State, in which each citizen has to be and to live his life through his whole community—the city. As he is associated in and through all the rest of his fellow-citizens, he has supremely the need of speech, which is called forth by the need of association. This requires that men communicate frequently, clearly, and in a variety of ways.

Hence comes that wonderful Greek expression, which has been far more lasting than the community from which it took its rise. First of all these forms of expression is the Greek tongue, which is the child of communal freedom. No one man makes it, for even to ancient Homer it came as a gift already existent, along with his Mythus. Language is made by associated man, and the Greek language by associated Greeks in their communal intercourse. But from the same source other forms of expression arose, such as sculpture, painting, music. Now our Herodotus it is who has given the first real expression to

History, that is, to the World's History, recording the supreme deeds of the Greek City-State, when these have become world-historical

Let it be said here that the Orient also expresses itself, but inadequately when compared with the Greek, who has made his expression universal and hence lasting. Egypt's expression, Babylon's expression both in speech and art—how undeveloped, confined, and concealed! The human race first begins to burst out into adequate utterance in Greece, which talks and sings and chisels and paints, not only for itself but for all futurity. The Oriental undoubtedly associated himself in communities, in cities, and in large ones; still he received his law from above, from the monarch, who chiefly needed to speak and not the people, as these are to obey the God-sent man and word implicitly. This is what the Greek was inclined to challenge; the City-State, in which he participated as citizen, voiced the law for him, often after deliberation and discussion. The associated Greek ultimately expresses what associates him, and what keeps him an associated Greek—the City-State. Into this institution he seems to be cast as into a mould. It is curious to see how completely fixed in the City-State are even the philosophers, Plato and Aristotle, who ought to transcend it, if anybody. But their political writings seek to restore it when it has had its day, and when a new

political order has already set in. Herodotus, however, portrays its bloom and highest triumph; though before he died, its disintegration had begun.

VII.

Our Historian does not give the origin of the Greek City-State; in fact he does not directly propound the question of its origin. How could he? It is his fundamental pre-supposition, the thing taken for granted, of which he is not fully conscious. He had not the historical perspective, he could not look back through a long evolution of governmental forms, which later History furnishes to the investigator of to-day. To be sure, he had before him the Oriental empire, which furnished a strong contrast to the Greek City-State. Therewith, however, his experience with political institutions quite ended. It is true that the various forms of the City-State—democracy, aristocracy, and monarchy or tyranny—were present to his mind and had to be treated historically in his work. The well-known discussion of these three forms in his Third Book he projects out of Greece into Persia. Still in them he is describing actual varieties of the Greek City-State, not possible kinds of Persian government. Undoubtedly, too, he mirrors opinions which he heard in debates, private and public, at Athens.

Herodotus, though he is unaware of the origin of the basic Greek institution, furnishes many materials for reaching back to its earlier stages. The extraordinary interest which our Historian took in barbarous peoples, and the large space devoted in his work to their description, show that he felt instinctively their importance in the World's History. The kinship of civilized and uncivilized Hellas was hardly known to him, and still more remote from his knowledge was the far wider kinship of the Aryan race, through which indeed the Greek and the Persian were related. Comparative Philology had not yet unlocked these racial secrets. Still he has left us the most complete ethnographical account of ancient Europe. He had not the usual Greek narrowness and exclusiveness toward barbarians. What we have elsewhere called the *ethnic* protoplasm of History he has given quite fully, even if in its separative, disconnected form. The dip back into this primitive racial stuff, which both Greece and Rome had afterwards to take, lay not of course within the historic experience of Herodotus. Yet he with a kind of premonitory instinct prepares History long beforehand for such a dip into its original creative sources by his extensive investigation of barbarous peoples, who lie all around and beyond that borderland of his which we call the Rim of Barbary. Moreover out of these barbarous peoples unfolded the Hellenic City-State,

evolving from their primordial Village Community into the stage in which Herodotus beheld it and its achievements.

Still more decidedly does our Historian suggest the movement from the older Oriental civilization into the newer Hellenic culture. The continuity of the line of City-States from the River-Valleys of the East to Greece is certainly hinted, even if not explicitly developed. The account of Egypt and Babylonia, both of which contained large cities, is a kind of preparation and prelude to the heroic deeds of the far smaller Greek City-States. There is always implied and sometimes expressed a connection as well as a contrast between the two worlds, Oriental and Hellenic, as well as their respective political and communal forms. Very interesting too is the attempt at a comparison of religions, notably that between the Egyptian and Hellenic Gods. Herein we may see the beginning of Comparative Religion, which has been supposed to belong to our own time. Of course the Greek Pantheon is the standard of comparison, for what other standard could Herodotus have? A line of evolution, therefore, runs out of the Oriental City-State with its developed civilization into the Greek City-State, and our Historian in his way draws that line.

He is also strongly geographical, but he is hardly conscious of the unique physical feature of Greece, namely its islands and peninsulas,

whereby it is more intimately connected with the sea than any other part of the globe, receiving therefrom a powerful influence in moulding its character. Insular and peninsular Hellas is quite all Hellas.

Such, however, are the three constituents which come together in order to form the Greek City-State—an ethnical, a civilized, and a physical. These we may set forth somewhat more fully.

We shall, accordingly, seek to trace briefly the origin of the foregoing Hellenic City-State whose importance in European History can hardly be overestimated. In fact, we may well deem it the germ from which all later forms of government in Europe have sprung. Still it too has its antecedents, or elements from which it originated.

The first of these elements is the civilized one coming to Greece from the huge cities of the Orient situated usually in its great River-Valleys, as the Nile and the Euphrates. In them civic organization started and was transmitted; in them men began to associate under law which was the will of the autocratic ruler. From the River-Valley the Oriental City-State passed to Phœnicia on the Sea, the intermediate stopping-place, where was developed the marine City-State with its commerce to distant lands through navigation. The heir of Phœnicia was chiefly Hellas, even if Carthage was of its own blood. With the Greek City-State on the Ægean a new

order begins, European History opens, as we see in Herodotus, the first great Historian, himself a product of that order, and native of a marine City-State. Thus the huge massified civic community of the Oriental River-Valley is broken up into many independent small ones.

But whence did their people come! Not from civilized Babylon and Thebes, but from the uncivilized Aryan migration which kept flowing in pre-historic ages out of Asia into Europe. This stream of migration at unknown times turned down into the three Mediterranean peninsulas, Greek, Italic and Spanish, and remained till the historic era. This background in later Greece was known as the Pelasgic stock, the rearward element which lagged in the rapid march of Greek civilization. Proto-Hellenic or even Proto-European we may deem this element, out of which the future peoples of Europe are to be formed by a power in themselves, yet also above themselves, moulding them gradually into the civilized Nations. This artificer of Europe begins with the rude and crude Aryan material, and shapes it into Hellas first, institutionally into the Hellenic City-State. He is the Prometheus who transforms that given primordial clay into the Greek man and his civilization. This Aryan clay we shall call the ethnic protoplasm, out of which Europe is to be shaped, the process going

on from that day to this, and not yet being ended by any means.

What did this old Aryan humanity bring along in the way of institutions? The Family certainly, and it may be added, the primitive Village Community, which they bore with them as their simple means of association. But descending into the Greek peninsula, they at an early day came upon Oriental civilization, which flowed in along the coasts over the sea, brought chiefly by the Phœnician trader. The result was both friction and fusion, by means of which that primal institutional germ became wonderfully developed into a totally new character. But why was it not massified like the Orient in its River-Valleys, whose original communities had been united and solidified into enormous cities? Here Nature enters with her help at the right moment.

The physical conformation of Greece has been much emphasized, and with justice. But we must not think, as some writers seem to have done, that Greek Nature generated Greek Spirit. If this were so, it ought to be productive still, and to bring forth Greek Peoples with their art, literature, with their sundry excellences and defects. But it is the surprise of History how completely and how suddenly such productivity of Nature stopped and never recovered its fertility in generating genius. Still there can be no doubt that natural conditions had a decided

effect upon the social and spiritual development of Greece at a given time, when all was fully prepared.

Already we have called Greece a peninsula, and we may also note that this one peninsula is split up into many peninsulas, running into the sea and marrying the same to the land. It is through this peninsular character that sea and land are so closely interlocked and interrelated in Greece. Moreover the territory becomes separated into many small divisions shut in by sea-walls as well as by mountain-walls. A glance at the map shows how completely Nature has individualized the Greek territory, making it naturally the home of small, independent, quite disconnected communities. To this physical fact we must add another bearing even more strongly in the same direction: the Greek sea is full of islands, in which the separation by water is complete. Thus Greece is quite as insular as peninsular (let us say again), having no great plains, no great rivers like the Orient with their extensive valleys.

Let us now conceive the waves of migratory humanity, that original Aryan protoplasm of peoples, sweeping into Europe and wheeling down into the Greek peninsular and insular territory, and settling there. Necessarily the mass is broken to fragments by the hand of Nature herself, thrusting them into these manifold divisions

of a small territory. Each fragment is not only separated but protected by physical ramparts, to which artificial walls are soon added. Thus there starts an inner local development of each community, Nature cuts off external power over them and remands them to themselves. Still there comes across the sea near at hand a commerce with a higher civilization, a knowledge of other lands and peoples, as well as the grand fact of navigation. Thus civilized Orient begins to weave itself into these little communal units, without subjecting them, however, or massifying them. Aspiration is kindled in each of these small centers; the Greeks become learners, appropriating and transforming their Oriental heritage in accord with their newly-developed institutional form, which grows with time into the autonomous City-State.

Next we must notice another physical fact: these islands and these peninsulas, though separated, are in clusters, are grouped together around some kind of a common center. We may consider continental Greece to be three peninsulas each rising over the other up to the Balkans. The Peloponnesus rays out from its Arcadian center into peninsular fingers reaching for the sea and dallying with its waters. The islands of the Ægean are mostly arranged in two clusters: the Sporades near the Asiatic mainland and the Cyclades which seem to be a continuation

of the Greek peninsulas. Thus the separated Nature of Greece has a tendency to associate its members in an independent fashion, reflecting therein another trait of these autonomous Greek City-States, that of hegemony or of free co-operation under a leading member of a group.

Such are the three strands which we can now trace into the Greek City-State—a civilized (coming from the Orient), an uncivilized (racial, communal), a physical (chiefly insular and peninsular). None of these can be left out of that Greek political institution which starts European History, and which is the underlying foundation of our Historian's work.

VIII.

Herodotus already sees that History does not stop with him, or perchance with his City-State; he places over it a God or a Power, which acts through itself and brings forth historic events according to a motive or end. The name which our Historian gives to such a supremacy is mainly Nemesis, who humbles a Darius or a Xerxes, the most exalted of terrestrial rulers. In such a conception lies faintly what we have called the World-Spirit, the Genius presiding over History, or the Spirit of the World's History, the latter being quite impossible without such a Spirit directing it to its end. Herodotus, we affirm, has glimpses of the World-Spirit and

seeks repeatedly to formulate it in his way, otherwise indeed he could not have written a world-historical book.

Now the most significant act in the movement of History, or of this World-Spirit, is the coming and going of States, especially their coming or their origin. In other words State-making is the genetic, ever-renewing process of the World's History. That ethnic protoplasm, of which we have already given a brief account, is really the original formable material out of which States are made. Who makes them and causes them to appear at the given time, or as we may well say, at the right moment? In our view, that is the chief, though not the only, function of the World-Spirit. The Nemesis of Herodotus rather presents the negative power in History, the humiliation of great States, and their evanishment. And it must be confessed that even the Hegelian World-Spirit is more decidedly negative than positive, since it is not so distinctly and impressively unfolded as State-builder, but it is more emphatically the World-Judge condemning the particular State for its historic shortcomings.

Still Herodotus has given, in his fashion, the important process of State-making, as this developed in the Greek world. Of course that which must be reproduced is the Greek political form, the City-State. This State-producing act

is called colonization, which plays a very considerable, though somewhat disconnected, part in our Historian's work. Each autonomous City-State is seen bearing City-States which are also autonomous, like the parent. Significant is it that the Father of History dwells with so much detail upon colonization, which is properly the Greek State-making. To be sure it is given as sporadic, instinctive, without conscious direction or supervision. Still it manifests mightily the working of the World-Spirit of that age.

Such is the first historic form of the reproductive act of the European State as recorded by its earliest Historian. It is instructive to compare Herodotus in this regard with the later and latest modes of the fundamental process of State-making. For the time has come when this can no longer be left to mere impulse and haphazard migration, which is that of barbarism; it must be rationally controlled in the interest of the supreme end of History, the State universal. And the modern Historian must begin to become conscious of it and its place in his science—which is hardly his mental condition as yet.

The History of Europe shows a continuous line of States arising and ceasing, a row of births and deaths of political forms. What is behind this process or above it perchance, and commanding it? If there be any purpose in this grand historical pageant, we must invoke the

controlling agency which has such a purpose. Here we place (we repeat) the world-historical Spirit, which, as its name indicates, is the Spirit which presides over History (shorter, the World-Spirit).

But at this point we wish to take a general survey of the manner of birth of European States. They spring up by an unconscious instinct; man is a political animal, says Greek Aristotle; man builds States naturally in Greece and in Europe, as the beaver builds his dam. To be sure in this instinct the World-Spirit is working; European History therefore shows States bubbling up, one after the other, and one beside the other in a chaotic fashion. Yet on the other hand they are controlled more or less externally for the end of Civilization. The migratory impulse is their first source moving in the main blindly and driving tribes to strange lands. State-making in Europe has, therefore, had no supervision, no rational direction from the State, which is both its origin and its end.

But it is certainly the outlook and the need of the State-making process, that it be rescued from caprice and chance. The State must rise to be in itself the State-making State; its genetic function, the most important one, must no longer take place in an uncertain random way. It must formulate this principle and embody it in its constitution. Such a constitution the modern

European Nation-State has not yet made and cannot, since it as imperial produces provinces, not States. If the society of European Nation-States ever unfolds from international Law or from the Hague Tribunal to an international Constitution, the State-making provision will be in order.

In this connection it may be said that the Constitution of the North-American Union is the first to regulate and determine legally the process of State-making. From this point of view it is the outcome of the European movement, having made the creation of States explicit and purposed from the previous more or less implicit condition. Provinces and colonies it no longer strictly produces, but States which are equal members of the Union, joining them into one political organism. Thus arises in History the State-making State constitutionally, which has in its turn to be continually made or re-made by the States which it has made. Each new State sending its Senators and Representatives to the Capital shares in the State-making process of the whole, or it has an equal part as State in governing not only itself but the rest of the States. Another function the American Union of States has now recently taken upon itself: to train purposely and consciously backward peoples into equality and unity with itself, which means not to enslave or even to subject

them — not to Hellenize or Romanize or even Europeanize them, by governing them from a central State in whose government they have no prospect of participation. Sooner or later the people or race which does not fully share in governing itself is going to make trouble. Self-government realized in institutions is the aspiration of mankind. The test of any form of State will be: How far does it satisfy that aspiration. To be sure, such an independent individual State is not the supreme historic end, for it too must be associated with other individual States in the movement toward the realization of the State universal.

Especially in the Nineteenth Century the historic trend of the society of European States is to endow with a Constitution each State of the society. That is, the inner movement of Europe is to constitutionalize itself through and through. Autocracy is to come under law, the Executive is not to be the one absolute power. The people of the State by their representatives are to participate in making the law which they obey, and the Monarch also is to act legally. Thus Law as universal is fast being enthroned in the European system of States. Russia, properly the most recent member of it, is seeking to establish a little bit of Constitutional government in the present year (1906-7). If she does, Constitutionalism in one form or other will have made

the circuit of Christian Europe, though even Turkey has been talking of it.

What is the model after which Europe has sought to constitutionalize itself? No doubt it is England. In one way or other the English Constitution has been the type for the enormous amount of Constitution-making which started with such fecundity in the French Revolution, and is destined not to cease for some time yet. To be sure, these are all written Constitutions, like the American, while the English boast that theirs is unwritten, and they set forth the advantages of such fact. Still we have to say that England developed the political Norm for contemporary Europe. This Norm was substantially completed by the so-called Revolution of 1688, and tested at home during the following century, after which it began to become European in the Nineteenth Century, taking possession strongly of the popular mind and finally of the various States.

We cannot help thinking, however, that Europe must in its political evolution transcend the English constitutional Norm, and England herself must too. For it has not the three Powers of Government co-ordinated, but all three subordinated to a subordinate power, that of Parliament, which is properly but a branch of the legislative Power. Certainly the more perfect governmental process is that of the three essentially equal and co-operant Powers. Still

the English Norm is the easiest for a people who are just starting to perform the act of self-government, they must not undertake too much at once, they cannot leap from absolutism to a completely organized freedom at a single spring.

Nor has the English Constitutional Norm a provision for State-making, and cannot have since it issues from and applies to the European Nation-State, whose imperial character would be destroyed by such a provision. Only the Federal Union of the United States could formulate and establish a true State-making process, could provide for the birth of autonomous and equal States, as distinct from provinces and subject States, which belong to an imperial government like the present Nation-States of Europe. For even England rightly calls hers an Empire, and her people and parliament rule distant nations without these participating in such rule over themselves, even if they have a quite full local autonomy like Canada. Of course in such judgments the American Constitution is taken as the criterion of Europe; the latest historic manifestation of the State shows what they all have brought forth. Hence they must be judged by their fruits, particularly by the last fruit, which is the American.

Naturally in present Europe the question comes up, What next? We must take note that out of this Aryan ethnic protoplasm of Peoples the

European States have been formed one after the other and together, till the material is used up practically, and the European group of States is complete. Quite recently two great States, Germany and Italy, have been nationalized. Europe has started the same process with lesser peoples, of which the Balkan group, partially at least, has been made over into Nations, being wrested from the crushing hand of Turkey, foe of European nationalities. Thus Europe as a whole seems to be taking a hand in State-making within itself; but outside of itself, in the Orient and elsewhere, it hardly yet shows any such tendency.

Though this process of State-formation in Europe has been blind, irregular, and wasteful of its material, still there has been over it an order, a forming power or demiurge we may call it — which has led on the way toward realizing the great end of History, the universal State. This, however, we must again repeat, is the World-Spirit, which thus has operated more or less externally in the matter of European State-making. But in the American government the attempt is to put each outside power inside the State, making the same an element of its working organism, which we therefore call from this point of view, the State-making State. In other words, the World-Spirit in the American Government has been constitutionalized, having been taken up into the process of the State itself.

In such fashion we cast back glimpses from the latest History to the earliest as recorded by the first Historian. We are to see in him the historic germs which have unfolded into the completer History of to-day. His explication is his true explanation. The little Greek City-State of his time has indeed had a wonderful evolution. From this point of view one may well affirm that the History of Herodotus is an original document, the most original and originative of all historic documents, having produced History itself as a human discipline. He cites little, he refers to some books; but for the main facts of his narrative he is the voucher, and he is the chief source not only of the recorded events but of History itself, which without him, would not be, at least not as it is. Marathon was indeed anyhow, as an event, but what would it be to us without the record of Herodotus? To be sure, many writers after him copy him, Grote copies him, but what a difference? In these days we hear much about going back to original authorities. But of all historic authorities Herodotus is, (we repeat, the most original, being the creator of the science which his successors can at best but produce in a new garb of events. Let the student take to heart that there is just one and only one primal creative document of History — our Herodotus.

IX.

In regard to the religious world-view of Herodotus, we observe a decided change from that of Homer. The Olympian Pantheon hardly appears, except casually and quite in the background. Pallas was indeed visible in the battle of Marathon, and Pan met the courier Phidippides on his way to Sparta for help against the Persians. Still the regular epiphany of the Gods, so strikingly organized in the *Iliad*, is not the method of Herodotus, who has made the transition to the Oracle, particularly that of Apollo at Delphi. The Homeric play of divinities is largely gone, being supplanted by their divine voice uttered through the prophet or priestess. Apollo no longer appears and speaks as he did at Troy (where he even fought), but he inspires the Pythia to respond for him, as at Delphi. This last is what Herodotus takes up into his History, in contradistinction to the way of the Epos. The religious heart of the Herodotean world is the Delphic Oracle which pulses its blood through his entire book from beginning to end. Moreover this oracular consciousness is that of the Hellas of his age, namely of the period of the Greco-Persian War. Delphi was then the religious, yea the national center of the Greek race. Still it could not organize this sentiment of common blood and nationality into

one State. It could, however, defend itself against Persia and the Orient.

Olympian Zeus has, accordingly, passed in the main the scepter to Delphic Apollo, whose historic mouthpiece for all future time is just our Herodotus. Not more decidedly is Homer the eternal recorder of Zeus and his Olympian world, than Herodotus is that of Apollo and his Delphic world. It was at Delphi that Greece tapped the stream of futurity, and interrogated her destiny, as we see everywhere in our Historian. Upon his pages we follow the Hellenic Folk-Soul trying to uncover its own mystery, and to glimpse its own task and fate in the mighty crisis at hand. In other words Hellas sought to know the decree of the World-Spirit through the response of the Oracle, especially in reference to the grand conflict between itself and the Orient.

After Herodotus rises another religious world-view which finds its highest expression at Athens in the Goddess Pallas Athena, and in her temple, the Parthenon. Self-conscious intelligence de-thrones oracular wisdom. Herodotus during his Athenian residence caught and appropriated many a gleam of the new order with its critical attitude toward the old view, still he as a whole remained Delphic and oracular. In his work the World's History opens with Cræsus, yea with Cræsus consulting the Delphic Oracle (see Book I and the following commentary). The historic

425

record of this new Athenian world is not and cannot be given by Herodotus, but by a very different historian, Thucydides, also the child of his city and time.

Undoubtedly our Historian introduces other ways of getting a revelation of the future—dreams, visions, omens, floating prophecies and oracles. These we cannot specially dwell upon, in the present connection. But we must revert to a view of his already mentioned, a view quite beyond the oracular or even the Olympian conception, namely that of Nemesis. In this view Herodotus tries to define the inherent nature of all divinity with two main predicates: first, the ruling God of the world and of its events is in action a leveler, abasing what is exalted; secondly, the motive for such action is his envy. The view is stated almost as an abstract principle, yet also is tinged with a divine personality; moreover it is chiefly uttered by the two philosophic characters, Solon and Artabanus (Book I and VII). However unsatisfactory such an opinion may be now, the chief interest remains that the earliest Historian endeavors to formulate the universal principle governing the World's History. In other words he has his philosophy of History, and takes pains to interweave it through his narrative of events, whereby it too starts on its evolution down to the present.

His doctrine of Nemesis was derived from

what he saw and read of the colossal governments in the Orient. Xerxes above all others is the grand example of the divine leveling of the loftiest monarchs, among whom however are also to be counted Cyrus, Cambyses, Darius, Oriental sovereigns, as well as the successful Greek tyrant Polycrates, who tries to escape the inevitable principle. The Historian's Nemesis really manifests that Greek character which shuns excess of all sorts, and is the divine power which punishes the infraction of Greek moderation on the stage of the World's History. In Herodotus the autonomous City-State is hardly subject to Nemesis, of which it is indeed the executor upon the Oriental and Greek imperial tyrannies of the age. The Nemesis of the City-State, therefore, lies outside the historic ken of Herodotus, still it will come (see Thucydides, *passim*).

In sentiment our Historian is not simply communal or tribal, but truly Pan-Hellenic. He participates deeply in the national Folk-Soul, sympathizing with it in its desperate struggle with the Orient. All its ways of utterance are not only his but naively and naturally his—story, myth, anecdote, proverb—which he weaves into and through his total work. Especially does he respond to its probing into the future for the purpose of finding out what is its portion in the coming clash of two worlds, what

the Supreme Orderer intends to do with it in the battle of principles. The Folk-Soul seeks to commune with the World-Spirit, sometimes through very inadequate means. Herodotus does not fail to record them, and thus reflects truly and vividly the consciousness of the time in little as well as in large.

But the true and highest mediator between the Folk-Soul and the World-Spirit is the Great Man of the period, the Genius who embodies both these ultimate elements of the World's History. The mighty collision between Greece and Persia produces such a Man, and Herodotus recognizes him fully and portrays him in his exalted function. This Great Man of the Age was Themistocles, the Athenian commander specially, but universally the lord over all Greece, forcing it even against its own will to obey and to fulfil the decree of the World-Spirit, which he alone rightly heard and adequately realized. In the Eighth Book our Historian shows him in his supreme deed and character: how he has prepared his little City-State with a navy, how he persuades its people to leave their old home on land and go down into their new home on their ships, how he compels his own side to battle at the right moment and in the right place, how he directs even the movements of the hostile Persians. Limit-transcending he is on all sides, surmounting obstacles in every direction, he seems to be one with

the all-controlling God; indeed he interprets the ambiguous, if not dissuasive Delphic response for his countrymen, and thus makes himself the real Oracle of the grand crisis.

For this reason the Eighth Book with its battle of Salamis may be regarded as the culmination of the Historian's whole work, indeed of the whole era which it depicts. On the other hand the Seventh Book is deeply depressing, verily tragic; the death of Leonidas with his three hundred Spartans at Thermopylæ is the death of free Greece, unless another City-State than the Spartan, and a different leader from Leonidas get control. The Eighth Book shows the grand change to Athens and Themistocles, which means the victory of Greece, the triumph of the City-State, and indeed the permanent separation between Europe and Asia, the deepest rift of World's History. (See *Walk in Hellas*, pp. 419-425).

The division of the History of Herodotus into nine books, called the Nine Muses, did not probably originate with the author. It is usually ascribed to the Alexandrine grammarians. The Ninth Book shows the completed victory over the Persians at Plataea and Mycale. The question has often been asked whether the History is finished. There is no doubt that the conclusion seems somewhat abrupt. Still the taking of Sestos on the Hellespont may well be deemed the final

act of the great war. The total theme was stated to be the conflict between Greece and Asia, bringing about the separation between Orient and Europe. In the Ninth Book the reader misses Themistocles; Aristides commands the Athenian land forces at Platæa and Xanthippus commands the fleet at Mycale. This Xanthippus was the father of Pericles, in whose time Herodotus resided at Athens.

This fact leads to the reflection that a good deal of our Historian's knowledge of Themistocles may have been derived through the son from the father, Xanthippus, who was the rival of Themistocles and was doubtless an important subordinate commander at Salamis. Some of the secret designs ascribed by Herodotus to Themistocles sound very much as if they had come from a political opponent, who is compelled to acknowledge the great deed of his rival, but disparages it by assigning to the doer a selfish motive. The next year after Salamis we find that Xanthippos had supplanted Themistocles in the command of the fleet. The latter's motive [in keeping open a way for fleeing to the Persian king, while dealing to him the hardest blows, has rather the appearance of an after-thought derived from the later career of Themistocles, and emphasizing his doubleness in contrast with the honesty of Aristides.

The Greco-Persian conflict, however, did not

end in a definite peace between the belligerents till the convention of Callias (450-449 B. C.) nearly thirty years after the capture of Sestos by the Greeks, with which the History of Herodotus properly concludes. In this peace of Callias the great separation between Greece and Persia, or between Orient and Europe, is acknowledged by both sides, and becomes a permanent element of the historic consciousness from that day to this. The conflict between these two powers, Greek and Persian, if we reckon it from the time at which Cyrus appeared in Asia Minor, taking Sardes (546 B. C.) and subjecting Greek cities, had lasted nearly a century. Of course the larger conflict, that between Europe and Asia, had begun much earlier (Homer's *Iliad* is based upon it, when fully seen into), and has lasted much longer, even unto the present day.

One of the difficulties of Herodotus is that Chronology, or the science of historic time, does not yet exist, though it is dawning. He has a tendency to reckon backward from his own time, which promotes if it does not force his viewing events in historic cycles. Still he has no common standard by which he can arrange occurrences synchronously. Indeed there were many such standards in the Greece of his time; Sparta had a public register of her kings, and probably of the respective lengths of their reigns. Each

important temple had a list of its priestesses from the beginning; Athens had its line of yearly Archons which became a kind of era. Of course these diverse standards were confusing. Finally the Olympiad, taken from the common Greek festival, became the common or chronological standard, being first employed, it is said, by the historian Timæus (flourished about 260 B. C.). He was a Sicilian residing at Athens, and wrote of the Grecian affairs in the West (Sicily and Italy) for an audience of Eastern Greeks, who naturally demanded a common measurer of distant events synchronous with their own. Thus the era of the Olympiads arose and became general. This was two centuries after the time of Herodotus.

THE FATHER OF HISTORY
(*HERODOTUS*).

BOOK FIRST.

What rank does this Book hold among the entire nine Books of the work? As a composition we are inclined to place it foremost of all. It does not contain events as celebrated as some in the last three books, such as Thermopylae, Salamis, Platea; still its artistic finish stands paramount, as well as its great picturesque variety, with hues ever shifting between Orient and Occident. On the whole, it furnishes the best field for studying the grand conflict portrayed in the total work, the conflict between Hellas and Asia. It also gives the best material for observing the most important psychological fact in all History, namely, the rise of the historic consciousness in the race, which now looks at itself and records itself in its deeds.

The Book falls into three main portions :—

I. The preliminary portion, which gives the prehistoric, mythical account of the conflict, the antecedents of the historical struggle. The Trojan War is indicated as the first or mythical counterpart to the Persian War (1–5).

II. The *Lydiad*, or the history of Lydia in its conflict with the Greek cities of Asia Minor, wherewith History, as conceived by Herodotus, starts into existence. In the *Lydiad* the setting as well as the fundamental conception are historical, but the mythical stream keeps playing into this historical movement and strangely transforms it into a new kind of composition, which we may call an epical History. The *Lydiad* is undoubtedly the most highly wrought portion of the Book, indeed of the entire work.

The difference between these two portions may be designated in a general way as follows: the Introduction is the mythical with the historical playing into it and ordering it; the *Lydiad* is the historical with the mythical playing into it and giving to it variety, relief, color.

III. The *Persiad*, into which the *Lydiad* unfolds, as the lesser into the greater, the local conflict into the universal one, with all Hellas on one side and all Asia on the other. Thus the two threads of which the whole is spun, are the Greek and the Asiatic, each being unfolded internally and externally to the grand climax in the Persian War.

I. PRELIMINARY.

The first five chapters constituting a kind of title page and preface, have a distinctive character. They deal with the mythical events which led up to the great historical war now to be recounted. They connect Herodotus with Homer. It is worth our while to look into their meaning with some fullness.

1. *The title-page.* Such we may designate the first paragraph, consisting of five or six lines in most texts and translations. The word *History* is here used by our author, who has transmitted it to succeeding ages. The primary sense of the word in Greek is *investigation* or *inquiry*; the corresponding verb means *to ask*, and is connected by its root with the verb *to know*; thus we reach the first signification of History as knowledge through inquiry.

Next we hear the author's motive for such an investigation: "that human events may not become obliterated by time, and that great deeds,

done by both Greeks and Barbarians, may obtain their share of renown." He is filled with the idea that he must preserve the memory of worthy actions; he gives the labor of a life to make them eternal. Such is the spirit of the author, truly historical.

We should also note that he is of Halicarnassus, is a Greek born in Asia Minor. He belongs to both Orient and Occident; his birth tends to make him sympathetic with both sides. This is the reading of all the manuscripts, though a passage of Aristotle designates him as a Thurian. But only in the last years of his life did he have his residence in Thurii, a town of Southern Italy.

Manifestly the worth of the human deed, when done by the free-acting individual or community, has strongly impressed itself upon the mind of Herodotus, and drives him to give it a lasting record. Particularly that deed of the Persian War is deserving to be handed down to all future time; really it begat in the race the historic consciousness, which feels that it must transmit itself to the coming ages. The Orient has no such history, for it does not recognize the worth of the individual; how can it then recognize and record the worth of his deed? The Oriental subject is a slave; who is going to record a slave's doings? Not the slave himself nor the master; then servile deeds are not worthy of

being recorded, not at least till they are done for the sake of freedom. But now the great historic deed has been done, the man with an historic spirit is also present ; the result will be a History.

Moreover it is hinted that a deep difference has arisen in the race through its passage from Asia into Europe, the difference between Greeks and Barbarians, the latter here meaning the Asiatics. A great war between the two sides is the consequence, which war is the theme of the present work. Still further, the cause of the conflict is to be investigated ; that is, we are to get back to its inner ground. Thus already the principle of causation begins to be applied to History.

2. *The preface.* The first question propounded, then, is : Who are " the causers of the difference ? " Whereupon the matter is carried back to the prehistoric mythical time and traced down into History. It is plain that the distinction between the mythical and the historical is present to our author's mind, not well-defined to be sure, still present and at work. Equally plain is it that both Mythus and History shared in this difference between the East and the West.

Greek Mythology has, as one of its chief themes, the conflict between Orient and Occident, the struggle between the Hellenic and the

Oriental spirit. Perseus and the sea-monster, Theseus and the Minotaur, Oedipus and the Sphinx, Bellerophon and the Chimaera are instances of fierce combats between Greek heroes and Oriental shapes, or monsters hostile to the Hellenic ideal. But the greatest of all these mythical deeds of Greece against Asia is that of the capture and destruction of Troy. Herodotus we shall find on many lines to be the successor of Homer, certainly distinct from him, yet growing out of him.

On the other hand, the greatest of the historical deeds of Greece against Asia was the defeat of Xerxes, also a phase of the grand conflict between Hellas and the Orient. The Greek Mythos of Homer and the Greek History of Herodotus have fundamentally the same theme, though the one be poetry and the other prose. Still we shall find that the Historian's form of treatment as well as his subject-matter, is interlinked deeply with the poet's. In this preface we may see a kind of bridge thrown over from the Mythos to the beginning of History.

In early fable the conflict takes the form of stealing high-born women — princesses and even queens. Each side seeks to possess the other's beauty, or ideal, though doubtless there was often a literal stealing of women in those rude ages. In our Historian's time the question arose: Who was the first aggressor? Who is

in the wrong? The matter was evidently debated with no little intensity both in Greece and in the Orient.

Now Herodotus cites and apparently adopts the Persian view of this antecedent mythical period, openly rejecting the Phoenician view and silently passing over the Greek view. "The Persians learned in history affirm the Phoenicians to have been the causers of the difference." Some sailors belonging to this people, visiting Argos for the sake of trade, stole Io, the king's daughter. So reprisals take place, and the feud begins, continuing in a kind of mythical see-saw between East and West. Three king's daughters, those favorites of the fairy-tale, are seized in succession, till finally the beautiful queen herself, Helen, is taken and carried to Asia. Then the grand expedition to Troy takes place, in which all Greece participates.

The following list will show the movement as set forth by the Historian :—

1. The taking of Io by the Phoenicians from Greece.
2. The taking of Europa by the Greeks from Phoenicia.
3. The taking of Medea by the Greeks from Colchis.
4. The taking of Helen by the Trojans from Greece.

Such are the four mythical cases here given. Note that they are arranged chronologically, and connected together by the common thread of retaliation; that is, they are arranged into a system. It should also be observed how extensive and how deep is the struggle; Medea belongs to the northern belt of Asiatic Persia, and is probably Aryan, though there is some question concerning the ethnic affinities of her people, the Colchians; Europa belongs in the South to a Semitic people; Helen is of Greece and is taken to Troy, which lies in Asia Minor. This mythical survey, accordingly, quite takes in the western boundary of Asia from North to South, and includes its two leading races, Aryan and Semitic. Thus the two sides, Hellas and the Orient, stand arrayed against each other in fable.

This preface leads to many reflections, the reader may well deem it an important document in the genesis of the present History and of the historic consciousness generally. He may profitably dig out its main presuppositions, and bring them up to daylight; some of these we shall set down as they have occurred to ourselves in meditating upon the work in hand.

1. It is manifest that Oriental peoples are taking an interest in Greek Mythology, and transforming it in accord with their own spirit. Persians and Phoenicians are here cited, each giving a peculiar turn to mythical incidents; later we shall

find the Egyptians doing the same thing (Book II). Especially Homer and the Trojan War they interpret from their own point of view, which is antagonistic to the Greek conception. Thus Greek Mythology is reacting upon its sources, and is flowing back to the East whence it sprang.

2. The legend of Io is here alluded to; it is interesting to see how the three peoples, Greeks, Persians, and Phoenicians have handled the same. According to the Greek story, Io is a virgin priestess beloved by Zeus and hated by Hera, watched by the many-eyed Argus, transformed into a cow which is driven by the gad-fly through many lands, till at last she reaches the Nile where she bears Epahus and becomes the mother of a race of heroic kings, obtaining again her human shape. A tale with a marvelous, divine element interwoven into its fabric—such is the Greek poetic conception; but the Persians make her simply a stolen woman, and the Phoenicians a runaway woman, voluntarily quitting home on account of an intrigue with a ship-captain. In the last two cases, the supernatural ideal element is entirely eliminated, and the whole thing sinks down into prose. Such is the Oriental treatment of the beautiful Greek Mythus of Io; so also the Egyptians will treat fair Helen.

3. The meaning of the Trojan War is strongly emphasized; it too was a conflict between Orient and Occident. The Persians did not care for

the capture of single women; for what is the individual to them? He has no rights, let him go. But these pesky Greeks, when Helen was stolen, raise a great pother, and "bringing together a mighty armament, go against Asia and raze Troy, all for the sake of a Lacedemonian woman." Such an act is indeed outside the Oriental consciousness, which deems it to be merely wanton violence. Accordingly "in the capture of Troy the Persians find the beginning of their hatred for the Greeks." Here again the key-note is touched; it is the worth of individuality over which the conflict between Hellas and the Orient takes place; for the Greek, unless that one person Helen be restored, then all the Greeks are lost. Moreover Persia represents Asia and the Orient: "they consider Asia and the peoples inhabiting it to be their own, while Europe and Greece they hold to be distinct." Homer, therefore, in the *Iliad* records the first great conflict between Orient and Occident.

4. The mythical wave of retaliation transmits itself into History. Xerxes regards himself as the punisher of the Greeks, and the avenger of the Trojans; on his march from Sardes against Greece he visited the citadel of Priam, made a great sacrifice of a thousand oxen there, and caused libations to be poured out in honor of the heroes (VII. 43).

On the other hand, Alexander the Great in his expedition against Persia visited the Trojan locality, and regarded himself as the avenger of the Greeks and the punisher of the Persians. Thus the Greek Mythus of Troy vibrates through all Greek history even down to the present, in which the Turk is the Oriental intruder in Europe. The antagonism between Greek and Turk is the old one, starting on the plains of Ilium, if not farther back; it is the deepest dualism of the World's History, in fact it is just that separation in the race which called forth the World's History in its continuity. Herodotus is, therefore, the first true historian, veritably the Father of History, inasmuch as he is the first writer who has grasped and recorded this grand dualism in its chief deed, which produced the historic consciousness.

5. Homer's Iliad, accordingly, furnishes the pulse-beat of the preface before us; but we can also find in it traces of the Odyssey. Herodotus may be regarded as a sort of Ulysses wandering over the world in search of knowledge; "he saw the habitations (*astea*) of many men and knew their mind" (Od. I. 3). The historian employs here that same Homeric word (*astea*, *habitations*) in reference to himself (5): "I, going over the small and great habitations of men, shall move forward with my narrative." Likewise the Phœnician story of the captured Greek woman

Io has a strong resemblance to a case told in the *Odyssey* (Book XV.); in fact, the last half of the *Odyssey* gives a number of tales in which occur abductions of men, women, and children at the hands of sea-faring men, both Greeks and Phoenicians. Eumaeus the swineherd is such a stolen child.

The mythical account related in this preface is put into a kind of system, with an ordering principle, inasmuch as all these cases are not given singly but are connected together in a series of wrongs and retaliations. Moreover they are arranged in succession of time, in a chronological order; the deed of Paris is specially marked as having taken place "in the second generation after" the stealing of Medea.

Thus the *Mythus* begins to be divested of its supernatural element, to be rationalized, systematized, and chronologized; it is indeed becoming historical. We may say of this preface of Herodotus that it still has a mythical subject-matter or content, but an historical form; it shows that the historic consciousness is penetrating the *Mythus* and ordering the same after the pattern of History. It is, therefore, an instructive document indicating the transitional stage of the mythical on its way into the historical, a half-way station between the Trojan and the Persian time.

But our Historian has now furnished his preface, and is going to pass into his true field. He

has let the Orientals give their side; but he will not vouch for its truth, though he probably thinks that they have the best of the argument in the mythical instances. He moves at once to the historical instance: "whom I myself know to have begun doing wrong to the Greeks, him I shall designate (5);" doubtless he has in mind Croesus, "who was the first of the Barbarians that subjected Greek cities to tribute (6)."

This Introduction is a pretty good sample of what is known in Greek Literature as mythography, which seeks to arrange the persons and events of mythology by some principle, ordering them in time, and rationalizing them often according to some theory. Before the age of Herodotus the mythographers had appeared, and shown an historic sense springing up inside the mythical sense. Our historian will never free himself of the influence of this antecedent epoch.

II. THE LYDIAD.

With Croesus, the Lydian king, the history of Herodotus makes its start, going back about one hundred years before the Historian's own time. We call this portion of the first Book the Lydiad, derived from Lydia, of which country the history is here given. The name is intended to be analogous to and suggestive of the word *Iliad*, derived from Ilium, which was the seat of the Trojan War. Moreover this entire account of Lydia (embracing chapters 6-94), is manifestly an evolution out of the *Iliad*; it is the epos going over into history, it is poetry transmuting itself into prose and not quite getting there. Already we have noticed that, to the mind of Herodotus, the Trojan conflict and the Persian conflict were essentially one—the grand conflict between Orient and Occident. And the struggle of the Greeks with Croesus was another chapter of the same story. We know also that Herodotus was steeped in the Homeric poems, and he, a

native of a Greek city which was subject to an Oriental monarch, probably felt the conflict of the *Iliad* as we cannot feel it at this distance of time. Nor should we forget that his uncle and educator, Panyasis, was an imitator and resuscitator of Homer. This History of Lydia we may well term an epical History, partaking of the nature of both the Epos and of History. It is, therefore, properly placed at the beginning; it is historical yet with epical elements moving through it everywhere, a grand metamorphosis of Homer into Herodotus. Mark, we do not say that it is imitated or copied from the *Iliad*; it is transformed therefrom, and thus becomes a new species of composition.

The reader probably wishes — or, if he does not, he ought to wish — to penetrate more fully into this genesis of the historian from the poet. We have named the *Lydiad* an epical History; what are its agreements and disagreements with the *Iliad*, the Epos? Let us mark down a few points.

(1) Both the *Iliad* and *Lydiad* have the same theme, the conflict between East and West. (2) Both have essentially the same locality — the boundary line running North and South between Asia and Europe, along which line the two contestants have arranged themselves through all ages down to the present. There have been

oscillations in each direction, forward and backward over the line; but to-day it is drawn in the same place essentially where we see it in the Iliad and in the Lydiad. (3) Both have a central figure, a hero — Achilles in the Iliad and Croesus in the Lydiad. Yet into both are woven many episodes and incidents pertaining to Troy and to Lydia, making an elaborate environment in which the central figure acts. (4) Both open with short passages (*proœmium*) which call attention to this central figure and his pivotal deed — the wrath of Achilles and the injury of Croesus to the Greek cities. Both, too, show the penalty coming home to the man for his deed; both, therefore, suggest a cycle of action, and are rounded out to completeness; both, accordingly, leave an artistic impression.

Still the Iliad and Lydiad are very different; in the latter we can see the historical element entering and dominating the epical. (1) Chronology comes in and arranges the dynasties and events of the Lydian kingdom according to their succession in time, ending in the capture of the city, Sardes. But the Iliad is not a history of the Trojan War, not a chronicle of its occurrences, though many are introduced, nor is the city, Ilium, taken at the end of the poem. In this fact can be seen that the outer setting of the Lydiad is historical. (2) The Olympian world of the Gods,

with their continued interference in the affairs of men in the *Iliad*, quite vanishes out of the *Lydiad*. There is still an overruling order, but not so much by means of personal deities (as abstract principles, such as fate, nemesis, divine envy, also divine justice. Different from these as well as from Homer is the Oracle, which plays such an important part in Herodotus. (3) In the *Lydiad* the stress is clearly upon the free-acting individual, the infinite worth of the human deed has begun to be asserted and hence recorded. In the *Iliad* man is also free, yet in his freedom he is still the instrument of the Gods; over him and his deed hovers the divine volition — “the will of Zeus was accomplished.” (4) Herein lies the fundamental ground of the distinction in form — the one is prose, the other poetry. The will of the Supreme God is the cosmos or divine order in the *Iliad*, which must be measured and sung, while man must be attuned to it at last through all his caprice and opposition. So we have in Homer the rhythm of the Gods, the hexametral attunement, which catches up the mortal in his wildest tumults and wanderings toward chaos and orders him to a musical movement. On the other hand in Herodotus this measured sweep breaks up into prose, as it records man’s free action, which cannot be encumbered by the trammels of verse in

its utterance, which causes the Gods and their measured gait to recede into the background.

As already stated, man has now risen to the consciousness that the fact is the great object of research, and is what is worthy of being set down in writ for all time. Prose thus begins, not poetry, which is truth but not fact. The reality with all its dissonance of free-acting individuals enters with power, and its scribe is the sober historian, not the musical bard, whose function it is to bring all into the harmony of Zeus, as well as into the rhythmic utterance of the same, which is his verse.

This *Lydiad*, therefore, is worthy of study not simply for its historical value, but for its psychological purport, being an important document in the psychology of the race as it makes the transition from myth to fact. We may see the epical consciousness moving into the historical, Troy transfusing itself into Sardes, Achilles into Croesus, Homer into Herodotus.

I. *LYDIA*.—This country is the western center of Asia Minor, and doubtless had a mixed population of Aryan and Semitic. Still almost everything about the ethnic affinities of the Lydians is a matter of dispute among the learned. Not the least of the problems pertaining to them is the question: Were they the parent stock of the Etruscans in Italy? It is our intention to shun this field of erudite con-

jecture, and to grasp for the main fact at once. And the main fact in the present case seems to be that two great race-streams, the Aryan and the Semitic, in their migrations toward Europe, met each other with a considerable shock in Lydia, both handing down strong indications of themselves into the historic age.

The course of this movement we may conceive as follows: The Semites, coming from the Southeast, from the direction of Syria and Arabia, dropped offshoots of themselves through the lower and middle portions of Asia Minor (such as the Cilicians, the Solymi and probably the Cappadocians) and finally reached Lydia and the sea; the Aryans coming from the Northeast and East, from the direction of Armenia, dropped offshoots of themselves (such as the Phrygians and Mysians) till they too reached Lydia, finding the Semites there before themselves, probably. The two currents of migration swirling in together, met at first in strong opposition doubtless, then they united and grew together as one nation, which always bore traces of its double origin. Compare the Saxon and the Norman in England.

Indeed Asia Minor must have been in prehistoric times a mighty seething cauldron of struggling peoples, which in their movements westward had been forced in between the two seas, the Euxine and the Eastern Mediterranean. The

two main races of human culture, Aryan and Semitic, were violently thrown together in Asia Minor, as if in some preparatory training for the World's History. The center of this ethnic maelstrom seems to have been Lydia, which became the most important nation of Asia Minor, when its conflicting elements had settled down into harmony and coalesced into one people. In Lydia Herodotus places the opening of his History, and starts there the great conflict between Orient and Occident in its historical manifestation. Let us observe who are here the contestants.

Lydia undertakes to subject the free Greek cities which had sprung up along its coast. But whence came the people of these cities? Across the Aegean, from the continent of Europe chiefly; Greece had sent out colonies to the coast of Asia Minor; these had some land, but their chief possession was the sea with its commerce.

A very progressive set of people they were, far more advanced and enterprising than their mother cities. Colonization had sifted out, as it often does, the strongest and most daring spirits of the land, also those with new ideas in their heads. The result was a line of Greek communities along the eastern coast of the Aegean, which led the civilization of the world in the sixth century before Christ. Miletus was the daughter of Athens, yet the daughter soon far

outstripped the mother both politically and intellectually. It took Athens something like one hundred years to overtake Miletus. Greek ideas — philosophy, science, history — first rose and flourished in these cities; especially the Greek political idea, the autonomy of the civic community, with strong leanings toward democracy, was fostered and deeply cherished. Continental Hellas seemed backward, stolid, helpless, while this marvelous new life was stirring in the cities along the coast of Asia Minor. These citizens were at that time the most Greek of the Greeks.

Strongly opposed to the Greek political idea of autonomy is the Asiatic idea, which is essentially that of absolutism. Now comes the clash. Lydia was evidently the most forward of the Asiatic States of Asia Minor; she was also nearest to the most forward of the Greek cities. Such were the conditions; a border conflict sprang up, which rose to be the conflict between Greece and Persia, between Europe and Asia, between Occident and Orient. But here was the germ — the border war between Lydia and the Greek towns of the coast, verily the most significant of all border wars. And we may add that here history came distinctively into being, born of the struggle between Greek freedom and Asiatic absolutism. For all History is essentially the record of man's struggle into freedom,

and this struggle first started for mankind along the Lydian border.

Such are the two sides in opposition; yet, in spite of themselves, a double process is taking place, each is modifying the other. Lydia is being Hellenized, it adopts Grecian customs, especially it recognizes the Delphic Oracle, which was the principle of unity in Greece, and for this reason probably was more acceptable to the Lydian consciousness. Lydia clearly rejected the political, but was inclined to accept the religious phase of Greek spirit. On the other hand, we shall see the Greek cities of the coast affected by their Asiatic environment, they will lose their intense Hellenism, or at least the resolution to defend it will wane, and they will become Oriental subjects, though not willing subjects.

A further result will be that both the Lydians and these Greek cities cannot be taken as the final bearers of the great conflict; the Lydians are too Greek, and the Greeks too Oriental. The conflict started between them will gradually pass into other and mightier hands, till it finally embraces two continents.

Such was the situation, such the combatants, such the conflict. But why is History, that is the World's History in its continuity, arising just here and now from a petty border war? It is the primal effort of a free community of free men asserting their freedom against servitude; such

a struggle is worthy of being recorded for all time by man for man, since he must remember it and be inspired by it to maintain his true selfhood. He is now becoming really a man; the individual thereby affirms his infinite worth, in fact, his immortality, when he makes his deed immortal. History is begotten of the consciousness that the individual must be self-determined, and hence imperishable, if his deed is not to perish. The pulse-beat of all Occidental History down to the present, the struggle for a higher liberty, is felt on this early page of Herodotus recording this conflict between Lydia and the Greek cities of the coast.

Very familiar does History seem to us now, but it was a great step, the step out of Asia into Europe and even across into America. The beginning of this marvelous step rose into distinct consciousness on the border-land before us, which also furnished the Historian, our Herodotus. But even he had predecessors, he was evolved out of a long series of mythographers, geographers, chroniclers. Probably the forerunner who came nearest to him was Hecataeus, belonging to that Miletus which was itself the spiritual forerunner of Athens, its own mother.

The *Lydiad* of Herodotus let us note again, is the most highly finished and carefully organized portion not only of the First Book but of this whole work. We believe that the student, if he

masters it, will possess the most typical product of our Historian, as well as the key to Greek History, including the very rise of the race's historic consciousness.

II. TIME BEFORE CROESUS (7-25). In the early portion of this Lydiad we find an introductory account telling of the time before Croesus. It is in the main a mythical attempt to connect Croesus with the past, and Lydia with the great peoples of the earth. It is hardly more than a meager genealogy, yet the names are suggestive.

First Dynasty. This begins with Lydus, son of Atys, who is the son of Manes (I. 94). Thus the Mythus accounts for the designation of the country (Lydus), and connect it with Phrygia specially in the name Atys, which is frequent in the royal family of Phrygia. Manes is a deity of these two peoples; or rather, it is the most universal designation of the First Ruler that exists in human speech. Old Teutonic *Mannus*, Egyptian *Menes*, Hindoo *Manu*, Greek *Minos*, besides the Lydian and Phrygian forms, are well known. The word in general seems to refer to the divine being who first ruled over man and brought to him government and the social system. The Mythus thus seeks to evoke the primordial starting-point of the existing order; the Lydian rulers are carried back to the mythical fountain-head of all civil authority. The

English word *man* may thus be held to have a world-wide affinity, and also a world-deep significance.

Second Dynasty. Here the Lydian rulers are mythically derived from Hercules (hence are called Heraclidae), the great Greek national hero, and also from Ninus (son of Bel, an Assyrian deity), who is the founder of Nineveh and the Assyrian Empire. A remarkable conjunction of names; one can see in it a mythical attempt to unite Hellas and Asia in a common origin, through a kinship of their greatest Heroes and Gods. Herein Lydia is seen standing between Orient and Occident, bringing the two extremes together in her former rulers. Such, indeed, we shall find to be the actual situation and character of the Lydian nation.

Very little history can be discovered in these genealogies, but we can see the great fact of the time putting on a mythical form, which has its significance as well as the historical form. The age of Herodotus is looking back at the aforesaid and making the same real to itself not by the way of the critical Understanding, but through the Imagination. Each method the student is to sympathize with, and to take up into his own spirit.

Some writers have held that the Hercules mentioned in this genealogy is the Lydian Hercules and is wholly distinct from the Greek Hercules.

Such a view seeks to bring into the Mythus a kind of formal consistency, whereas it is the nature of the Mythus to fluctuate and vary in its forms, when it has to express a new significance. The Mythus is truly plastic, formable, not the rigid historic fact.

The last ruler belonging to the Heraclidae was Candaules, in whose time a new change of dynasty takes place. The historian seeks to give the ground of this change, and again he betakes himself to the Mythus, but in a fresh shape. Not a vague genealogy now; the story enters in order to express the meaning of the revolution.

The story of Candaules hints of the conflict between Greek and Barbarian in an important point of manners. The Greek loved the human body as the most perfect work in all creation; he made it the abode of the God. Very necessary is this culture of and reverence for the body as the temple of the individual soul in life. The Oriental hid the body, was ashamed of it; in his eyes it belonged to the individual, who was little or nothing, a slave, and destined to vanish.

Hence the difference between Orient and Occident develops at the start into a difference as regards the body. The Greek exercised naked in the palestra, and contended naked in the Olympic games. Never again will a whole people probably have the same inner delight in the poetry of the body and its movement as the old Greeks

had. They tore off the Oriental rags, doubtless then more slattern than now, and revealed themselves to themselves in their individual bodies, fit abode for the Gods.

In all this we can see that rising consciousness of the worth of the individual, which takes on many forms at the present epoch. It is no wonder, therefore, that the Greeks seemed to the Oriental to be lacking in chastity. Yet not a mere tingling of lust was this love of the body, it was a phase of their progress, of the glorification of the individual. Even the face is often masked in the East.

Now we can begin to understand the story of Candaules. He was clearly hellenizing, those Greek ideas were becoming strong in him. His friend was Gyges; that friend he wished to look on the most beautiful object in the world. So the little drama with plot and dialogue plays its first act. But then comes the counterstroke. The woman, the Oriental queen, holding to her custom, deems herself the most injured of mortals; only the death of the husband can atone for the wrong.

So Candaules loses his realm not simply for his love of beauty but for his love of imparting it to others. The woman resents the attempt to make her a Greek model. Who will refuse to say in these days that she has not her right? But the anecdote is truly characteristic; it shows

the two ways, Greek and Oriental, of considering the human form; moreover the source of Greek art, of its statues, is suggested in the story.

The same question has its pertinence in these days. The Greek world of art has left us its legacy of nude statues; what is their effect on morals? Still further, the study of art demands the nude model; is such a thing to be permitted in our world which still holds to an Oriental religion? So the old conflict between Greece and the Orient, that conflict which deposed Candaules, is not yet settled; to-day it is upon us, and often breaks out with fresh fury. And there is no doubt of the danger. But artists will tell you that the very function of art is through the senses to rise above the senses, to master the sensuous and make it the step to the eternal.

Moreover, we may glance at the dramatic, indeed tragic element in the story of Candaules. Here is Guilt, the king violates the ethical consciousness of his people doubtless, but certainly of his wife, who is also queen. Two national, perchance world-historical ideas begin to show their conflict in this little tale; note too that the penalty is to be brought home to the guilty man from the spot where the wrong took place. Still this punishment will call down retribution "upon the fifth descendant of Gyges," namely

Croesus. So the tragic deed of guilt perpetuates itself in a way similar to what is seen in the House of Agamemnon. Herodotus was contemporary with the great Athenian tragic poets, Aeschylus and Sophocles, and it may be often observed how he shares in the tragic consciousness of his age. He falls naturally into the dramatic form, and has a profound sense of the dramatic collision. To be sure this collision in the present case is merely suggested by a little tale, but this suggestion reaches down to the deepest fact of the age, the grand conflict between Hellenism and Orientalism.

Third Dynasty. This is called the Mermnadae or children of Mermnas, which name is otherwise unknown. Herodotus mentions five kings as belonging to this dynasty, whose names and reigns chronologists have set down in the following order:—

Gyges	B. C. 716–678.
Ardys	“ 678–629.
Sadyattes	“ 629–617.
Alyattes	“ 617–560.
Croesus	“ 560–546.

There is much difference of opinion among the learned about these dates (see Rawlinson's Essay on Lydian History, appended to the first volume of his translation of Herodotus). Into such discussions we shall not enter; but it is worth

while to note that our historian has no era (like the Christian era) by which to order historic time. Still it is plain that he is dimly groping for such an era, calling for it, we may say; he has the idea of temporal succession, and is measuring it by dynasties, generations, and years.

We have already sought to discover what lay in this last change of dynasty — a reaction against the hellenizing tendencies of the monarch, Candaules. His successor Gyges, however, still retains a religious connection with the Greeks, especially with the Delphic Oracle, to which he made presents. It is to be noticed that Apollo was probably the God of Asia Minor, at least more highly revered there than any other deity; he was worshiped in the Troad, as we learn from the *Iliad*, and sided with the Trojans and their Asiatic allies against the continental Greeks in the Trojan War. But in the time of Herodotus, Apollo had moved west (though rocky Pytho is known to Homer), and acquired a transcendent influence in Hellas proper, which he did not possess in Homer. So all these Lydian Monarchs show a Greek religious affinity and come to their God across the Aegean. Gyges, however, is said to be the first of the Barbarians (with one exception) who dedicates offerings at Delphi.

Now the grand historic conflict of these four Lydian kings before Croesus is with Greek cities

of the coast, especially with Miletus, which had shown a wonderful development and had produced great individuals such as Thales, Hecataeus, Thrasybulus. It was a seafaring people, hence the land people, the Lydians, could not cut off their supplies.

After a variety of historic events intermingled with anecdotes, another tale is woven into the narrative, a tale with a supernatural element, in contrast with the story of Candaules, which has no such element. Arion is a famous singer, who is saved by his power of song, which charms a dolphin to do his will. The leading points are three.

First is the deed of wrong. Second is the supernatural conduct of the dolphin under the influence of Arion's music. Nature yields to the sweet sway of harmony — a theme elsewhere treated in Greek legend (Orpheus, Amphion). Third is the punishment of the guilty; wrong, which is the grand discord of the ethical world, is undone. The whole is a genuine fairy-tale, with its miraculous intervention to save the innocent and worthy, and with its underlying substrate of faith in an ethical order. The power of the tale is enhanced by making the victim of wrong a singer and harpist, or a producer of harmony, against whom the wicked here conspire. Thus they assail the outer harmony, which suggests the inner harmony; indeed both

kinds of harmony, the musical and the ethical, are assailed, and also vindicated.

Such is the heart of the wonderful Tale of Arion and the Dolphin, which has been a prime favorite in all ages, having been wrought over into many literary forms, ballad, narrative, poem, prose-romance. Numerous attempts have been made to rationalize or allegorize the present tale, for instance, by making the dolphin a wooden one at the ship's prow, on which ship Arion escaped, or by making Arion a good swimmer, as good as a dolphin, or by making the whole into an allegory setting forth the power of music, etc. Still, the best way is to keep the tale as it is, being a genuine expression of a phase of human consciousness. But we should by all means inquire what is that human consciousness which seeks to express itself and its view of the Divine Order of the World in the form of a fairy-tale. Under the narrative we must reach down the ethical purport, which is the heart of it, and its ground of existence. This little tale of Arion and the Dolphin beautifully reflects a faith in a world-justice and a providential ordering of things in this life.

We also catch a glimpse of some of the difficulties in these Greek cities. Dissension within and without; no Ionic city helped the Milesians except Chios. The confederation was weak, the jealousy of the strong city shows itself; the

disease of Greece, of which she at last perished, makes its appearance.

Then we see an internal change. A number of these cities, Miletus in particular, had fallen under the rule of a tyrant (or king). Thus an Oriental tendency had started, quite different from what we find in Homer. This tendency also passes into continental Greece, and most of its cities had their tyrants. While we behold the Orient and Hellas in a mutual opposition, we can also observe that there is even to this an opposite tendency, which brings both together.

In looking back at these three dynasties we may observe a slow dawning of the historic consciousness, and with it a beginning of a World-History. Especially during the third dynasty (the Mermnadae) does the conflict become clear, the great conflict between Hellas and Asia. These Lydian monarchs wage war almost continuously against the neighboring Greek cities, trying to subdue the rising influence. This small border war we shall see develop into the great Persian war, and reveal the deepest dualism in all History.

With the peculiar intermingling of the mythical and historical streams, the Historian reaches the reign of Croesus, to whom the previous narrative has been leading up, as the grand central figure of the Lydiad. About one hundred years before the historian's own time, Croesus lived,

and called forth the preliminary conflict, the first important historical conflict between East and West.

III. CROESUS. — We now enter upon the drama of Croesus (26–94) distinctively, which is portrayed in three stages, which may be called the Rise, Culmination, and Decline of the Lydian monarch.

The first two stages are treated with greater brevity than the last; the impressive thing is the decline and fall of a mighty individual. The stress is here placed, therefore, upon the going down of Croesus, after great success. Drama, Epos, History are united in a new kind of composition; story, dialogue, oracle, riddle, omen, miracle, anecdote have their place in the variegated totality.

1. The Rise of Croesus is given in a few paragraphs (26–28). He passes rapidly before us as the hero triumphant, victorious in the East and West, as far as his arms extend. He shows himself the ablest of the Lydian kings, and manifests a great character, round which the events of the time revolve. It becomes plain that he, like the Oriental rulers, is strongly possessed with the idea of conquest, of extending his country's limits; any boundary is an insult to his authority, and he proceeds at once to overcome it. An immediate annulment of the limits of nature is the Oriental spirit; that which is individual-

ized has no right to be. So Croesus shows traits of the Oriental conqueror.

At the same time he manifests strong Greek affinities. No doubt he has a good deal of Greek culture; it is clear that he participates in the intellectual movement of the Ionic cities of the coast. He keeps up his relation to the Delphic Oracle also, after testing it; this testing of the Oracle shows his mental tendency. "Wise men came to him" (29), such as Solon, Thales, Bias. He conquers the Greek cities and makes them pay tribute; he thinks of reducing the Islanders, but he had no navy and evidently could not trust the Greeks of the coast against Greeks of the islands. Then he carries his arms eastward, making the river Halys his boundary. Here he begins to impinge upon another rising Asiatic power.

Thus Croesus is placed at the height of his glory. The history of these conquests is not told in much detail; probably Herodotus did not know much about them. At any rate the impressive thing is not the rise but the fall, the descent from a great career. And this is what the historian now portrays with a decided dramatic power. The tragic view of the Great Individual is presented, he is born to collide and to perish, the very Gods are supposed to be jealous of him, and to drive him against his limits.

Really however he drives himself against them. The Greek cultivated individuality.

Hellas reared many of the mightiest men of all time. Yet they were tragic, they were too great for their city, for their nation, yea, too great for themselves. Hence after Homer's Epos rises Greek Tragedy, which has this conception at its foundation. Great is the individual, but the greater he is the more tragic.

Now this fundamental consciousness Herodotus is going to apply to Croesus, and on a far vaster stage to Xerxes. So Croesus is to be seen in his struggle with the fate which his own greatness and success have called up against him; his own good fortune evokes the Furies.

Moreover the historian has motivated the guilt for which follows vengeance; the dynasty of Croesus is tainted by the dethronement of Canaules; the Oracle has declared that retribution will come after five generations. But the chief crime of Croesus and of his dynasty is that of enslaving the free Greek cities; he has wronged the Hellenic spirit, which just at this epoch happens to be the bearer of civilization.

2. Croesus is next to be brought before us in the height of his glory. The poet-historian introduces a dramatic scene of striking vividness, in which Solon and the Lydian king are the speakers. The content of this scene is of a reflective cast, ethico-didactic in spirit, and heralds the dialogues of Plato. A new literary form is thus introduced into the historical narrative; the dra-

matic subject is not now mythical, but philosophic. The chief speaker is an Athenian, a free citizen of a free State; moreover a lawgiver of freedom, a traveler and a philosopher. A remarkable combination: Solon has in the first place united liberty with law in his own city; then through travel he has transcended the narrow limits of his own locality and become cosmopolitan, universal; finally through philosophy he is able to formulate reflectively his view of the world. Croesus, in the acme of his power and wealth, is summoned by the Historian into the presence of such a man, and is made to give an account of himself.

It is highly probable that the whole interview is fictitious; there are chronological difficulties in the way. Still our Historian does not disdain the imaginative form to set forth historic truth. And the historic truth here is that two kinds of consciousness, two stages of human development are placed alongside of each other and contrasted, in the persons of their highest representatives, Solon and Croesus, the free citizen and the absolute monarch. Again we behold a new image of the grand theme, Orient and Occident.

The question takes the form of who is the happiest man? Or more directly stated according to the point under discussion, What kind of a life is most worth living? We are to look to

the total life, to the very end thereof, in order to find out. The philosopher answers in substance : "Not thou, O King Croesus, with all thy wealth, but Tellus the Athenian who was a good citizen of a good State, father of good sons, and died a glorious death for his country." Very strongly does this reply set up the free Athenian citizen as the ideal man, having his institutional life in Family and State and dying at last for his country.

Then comes the second instance ; again Croesus is not chosen, but Cleobis and Biton, two Argive youths, who gave a remarkable example of filial and religious devotion, and at once were taken to the Gods, "who thus showed that it is better to die than to live." Once more the man of humble station fulfilling some ethical function and dying therein is held up to Croesus as the pattern of happiness, or of right life and death. The Athenian case was domestic and political, the Argive case was domestic and religious, both celebrate what may be called the ethical as the true source of happiness, in contrast with the wealth and power of Croesus.

So much for these instances in which we see the humble condition of the free Greek glorified, his ethical devotion to family and country and god, and his dying not in a deedless quiet but in fulfillment of some worthy action. A philosophic view of the life and death of the ordinary

individual is thus held up before the Oriental despot. Of course the latter could not see the subject in that light.

Then Herodotus introduces his peculiar notion about the Gods: they are jealous, and are levelers of the high and mighty. What does he mean? Does he intend to put an ill-disposed Providence at the head of the Divine Order? So it seems. Now this view springs from two sources. Herodotus saw the most powerful rulers of the Orient humbled — Xerxes, and this Croesus, not to speak of other lesser instances. Then he saw the fate of the great individuals of the Greek States, Pausanias and Themistocles, for example. The deity Nemesis levels all.

This is, then, a statement of the tragic view of the individual, which belongs to the time, and indeed of the tragic view of the Greek World. The grand mediation of Man with the Divine and also with himself is the work of Christendom, which is therefore not tragic. But Heathendom is tragic in its outcome, and its best spirits know it, and portray it. Hence the Greek Tragedians. Still, at the start, the Homeric epical consciousness is not tragic, since both the heroes (Achilles and Ulysses) after their wrath and error, are restored, do not perish, at least not in the poems, though Achilles knows he has to die young. But as the Greek consciousness developed, putting more and more stress upon the individual,

it felt the tragic counter-stroke, felt that greatness turned loose the Furies of Death.

Thus Solon bids Croesus wait for the end, before he can be pronounced happy. "Wealth does not make happy." Herein the humblest individual may be superior to a king, is indeed likely to be. In such fashion does Solon assert his Greek principle of individuality, and give a democratic Athenian tinge to his talk. Lawgiver too, he is; for all have come under the law in equality, no absolute monarch can control law, specially the law of Nemesis — not Croesus, not Cyrus.

Solon has asserted to the Oriental monarch the universal point of view, and subsumed the monarch under it, philosopher that he is; has made the monarch submit to law, lawgiver that he is. Did he not leave Athens for ten years that he might not repeal his laws, and that the Athenians might have to submit to them? A great discipline for that commonwealth, and for him, too; we behold now arising the law-giving consciousness, which, however, reaches its bloom in the Roman spirit, when the whole world, and not merely one city, is brought under law. Zaleucus, Charondas, Lycurgus, Solon, are all individual precursors of Rome.

Such was the warning given to Croesus, who did not, could not, take it with his consciousness. Solon says to the proud monarch: "I shall level

thee with rest of mortals, I shall be thy Nemesis ; I shall read to thee the law of the Divine Order, under which thou, too, must come ; I shall teach thee a lesson of philosophy, which is of universal application, making no exception even in favor of kings." Before the tribunal of the Idea the philosopher humbles Croesus, placing him below the simple Athenian citizen Tellus. What next? This Idea is to begin its realization, in which fact the preceding scene is to connect with what follows.

3. The downward movement of Croesus is the last and fullest act of the Croesus drama (34-91). The interview with Solon shows the Lydian monarch at high tide of external prosperity ; it also hints the internal spirit, the pride (*hybris*) of the man, which is the preparation for the turn in his affairs. A look into the soul of Croesus is given, by which we see the motive for his decline and fall.

There is no doubt that the Historian portrays the lot of Croesus with sympathy. Herodotus was born not very far from the boundaries of Lydia, and in his youth he must have heard many traditions of the famous Lydian ruler, whose conqueror was Persia, the great enemy of Greece. But it is certain that our Historian shows still greater sympathy with the doctrine of Solon, who is here the real Oracle of Croesus, having given the true response to the proud mon-

arch, in the way of warning. Athenian wisdom is unconsciously placed above the Delphic Oracle.

So we mark the turning-point: "a grand indignation (*nemesis*) from God" fell upon Croesus, of which the cause, according to the conjecture of the historian, was "his deeming himself the happiest of all men." Of this decline then may be noted five distinct stages: (1) the domestic tragedy in which the king will lose his son and heir; (2) the consultation of the Delphic Oracle, whereby Croesus seeks to unite himself with the religious feeling of Greece; (3) attempted alliances with Athens and Sparta, in which Croesus seeks to unite himself with Greece politically against Persia; (4) struggle with Cyrus, and defeat; (5) the denouement, in which Croesus loses his kingdom, but is personally saved.

These five stages we shall now set forth singly, as they unroll in all their diversity of color, style, thought. Each of these stages may be said to have its own literary form and quality — which fact is one of the main points to be discerned.

(1). The domestic tragedy sweeping in upon Croesus, which is here narrated (34-45), strikes him a blow in the tenderest spot; his son is slain, his only son, except one who is deaf and dumb — a calamity to his family and to his state.

The king has a dream foretelling the death of his son, which dream he regards as a divine warning, and which he tries to circumvent, to no purpose, however. Croesus is in the leading strings of Fate, and every act of avoidance becomes simply an act of furtherance.

The tale is a tragedy somewhat after the pattern of the Athenian dramatists. Particularly Oedipus is suggested, whose lines of life are laid down for him in advance, and he cannot escape. The fateful Oracle hangs over him : unwittingly he will slay his own father and marry his own mother. So Croesus brings about the very means for the fulfillment of his dream (which is oracular), nay we shall see him in the political arena moving forward to his own undoing. Herein Herodotus, as on other occasions, shows himself sharing in the tragic consciousness which produced the great Athenian tragic poets ; indeed he was the friend of Sophocles and had doubtless seen or read the latter's *Oedipus Rex*.

The most interesting of the characters of this present drama is Adrastus, the fateful man, who, innocent of intentions, does the most terrible deeds. He slays his brother unwittingly ; he has to flee from home under a curse, comes to Croesus, who purifies and receives him back into the social order. A curious conception, yet by no means unnatural ; Adrastus takes Fate with him wherever he goes ; perhaps because he

broods over it, he cannot get rid of the fixed idea about it, and thus accomplishes his own presentiments. Typical is such a person for Croesus now; Adrastus, "the doomed," enters the Lydian Court; indeed we may consider Adrastus as a phase of Croesus himself. For Croesus deems himself the happiest of mortals, above the stroke of destiny; just behold, O Croesus, this man, the victim of the Gods; are you exempt? You shall soon see. We are touched by the humanity and kindness of Croesus, who purifies the man of misfortune and even forgives his terrible deed. Still the blow descends; not exempt from Fate is the king, indeed he is exposed to it specially by his exalted position.

Thus the philosopher with his abstract statement of a view of the world goes in advance, and the illustration is enforced in a vivid dramatic scene. Nemesis is at work; does Croesus recognize it?

Of course the modern world cannot accept this Herodotean idea of nemesis, fate, and divine envy. Already in the olden time Plato opposed strongly the doctrine of envy. We must believe that man makes his own fate, if he is overmastered by it; the inner fortress, the mind, in its freedom, must be made proof against fate. Man cannot wholly avoid accident and so can be reached externally by the external; but this

cannot overcome him internally unless he lets it. Still we must throw ourselves back sympathetically into the time of the old Historian and appreciate his consciousness.

(2) The dealings of Croesus with the Delphic Oracle come next in order (46-56). We have already seen in the case of his son, that Croesus was accessible to a supernatural influence; the dream was a kind of Oracle whose fulfillment may have influenced him to this new step of consulting the Oracles. But first he will test their truth; then, when he has discovered the right one, he will seek to gain it. In fact, this entire section may well be considered his attempt to conciliate the Greek religious spirit through its leading Oracle. Then a political object (possibly he was not wholly conscious of it himself) underlies these religious offerings of Croesus to the Greek God. For some reason he felt the necessity of sacrificing quite a portion of his treasures, which our Historian saw still at Delphi. From this dazzling account (the Greeks were always and still are relatively poor) has come down the saying: "As rich as Croesus."

Thus the Lydian monarch reaches out toward the religious heart of Hellas. He seeks to conciliate it, to win it, perchance to purchase it indirectly. What is the meaning of his conduct?

The time has come when Croesus has to take sides, he cannot be Oriental and Hellenic too.

As it is, he is a middle man, he is in Asia, yet in contact with Greece, an Oriental despot with a good deal of the Greek spirit in him. The Persian Empire is rising, a new hero appears in the East, Cyrus; with him Croesus has to reckon. That Empire means the total absorption of Western Asia and Croesus knows it, he prepares to dispute the new power.

For this purpose he seeks alliances with Greece. To be sure, the Greeks must regard him with suspicion, for he "has enslaved their brothers in Asia." But first he will put himself in harmony with the Greek religion which at that time found utterance in the Oracle, specially the Delphic Oracle. This was a wise move on the part of Croesus. For the Greek consciousness had its expression in these Oracles, there was indeed no other expression for the total Hellenic race. Politically the Greeks were divided into hundreds of conflicting communities, scattered over a wide stretch of territory from Sicily and Italy in the West to the Euxine in the North and Africa in the South. The Delphic Oracle was their voice, their unity, their center, and it strove to preserve and keep alive the common Greek brotherhood, which was felt by all, and to a degree obeyed by all, when voiced by the command of the Oracle.

Such was its chief sphere, a true one, though it was often consulted on matters which lay out-

side of its horizon, and so became ambiguous. But why this form of expression? The oracular consciousness feels the totality immediately, has it not in the form of reason, but of feeling, or perchance of inner vision. What is universal it feels in the particular event and speaks it forth; no ground it has but its own self — a kind of intuition of the Greek national spirit. Hence the rise and the authority of the oracular consciousness. Herodotus shares in it, though it was departing in his day before the coming philosophic culture. Yet even Socrates with his demon has not wholly lost it.

Our Historian, true to the spirit of his time, and specially to the time of the Persian War, weaves this oracular thread through his history; it would indeed be imperfect without the same. He is in the transition from the oracular to the historical; his follower in history, Thucydides, has quite lost this oracular element from his consciousness.

Croesus also has this oracular spirit, though not without some questioning; he has no longer implicit faith. He would test the Oracles beforehand, to see if they did really foreknow — not only the Grecian, but also the Libyan, that of Ammon. He finds out the truth of the Delphic Oracle by a cunning stratagem. Now this is the difficulty; we with our view of the matter question the truth of the particular

case, but there can be no question of the general reason for the choice. The Delphic Oracle, expressing the united spirit of Hellas, was for him the true Oracle which he must consult. That fact his own insight would tell him, yet he required also the special confirmation and got it somehow. Croesus is skeptic enough to make trial, though he has faith likewise. Yet he can also proceed on purely rational grounds to determine his conduct. There is in all war a vast field for chance; especially so was it in the olden time. He cannot wholly ignore the indeterminate, and so there is room for the Oracle outside of what is calculable.

Looking at it from our point of view, we see that Croesus could not well have done otherwise. Is he willing to be absorbed into the new Oriental Empire? No. Then he must appeal to the Greek spiritual principle and find its Oracle. For the Greek specially is the foe of Asiatic absorption, the upholder of individuality.

Now come his presents to the Oracle, which have made his name famous for all time, and proverbial. He seeks to conciliate the Oracle, and win its voice to his side; or, better, to conciliate the Greek consciousness, which he knows he has deeply offended by his subjugation of the Greek cities along the coast of Asia Minor. Such is probably the meaning of these presents, an act of restitution; the most of his tribute

from his Greek conquests he takes and devotes to the Greek God. An atonement one may read in this, in the presence of all Greece.

What will the Oracle say? Thrice it answers. First it tells what King Croesus is doing at that moment, proclaiming its vision over space; secondly, it tells him "he would destroy a mighty empire;" the third is, "When a mule shall be king of the Medes," then comes danger to the Lydian. These last two oracles depend on ambiguities, really they lay outside the scope and the meaning of the Greek Oracle, which has to help itself out with double meanings. For the real question which comes home to the Oracle, representing Hellenic consciousness, is this: Is Croesus the true bearer of the Greek world and its spirit against Persia and the Orient? To such a question there can be but one answer, No! The Lydian king is an Oriental despot, in spite of his hellenizing tendencies; he has subjected Greek cities to his absolute rule. So Delphi, the voice of Hellas, avoids the issue, nay, is willing to egg Croesus on into a fight with Persia, turning one Oriental against another.

Really, then, the attempt of Croesus to gain, or perchance to buy, the Oracle is a failure. How could it be otherwise? He cannot be accepted by the Greeks as their head, their representative, nor can he be taken by the Oriental peoples of Central Asia as their leader. He falls

between the opposites ; the spirit of the age, after foreshadowing its great conflict in him with his double tendency, will eliminate him.

(3) The political design of Croesus now starts to make itself manifest (56-70). "He began to inquire carefully who were the most powerful of the Greeks, whom he might gain over as allies." Accordingly we have in this part a short ethnic dissertation (56-58) on the origin and relationship of the Greek tribes. Not plain is the passage (the manuscripts are said to be defective here), and it has given rise to a great diversity of opinion. The Historian, after noticing the dual division of the Greek stock into Doric and Ionic (or Hellenic and Pelasgic) seems to derive both primordially from the Pelasgic race. Thus far back in the prehistoric time there was a kind of rude Greek unity, which now, however, is split up into many independent commonwealths, each asserting its own individual right of existence. Still there remains the religious unity of the Greek consciousness, centering more in Delphi at the present time than in any other place.

After Croesus had, as he supposed, conciliated the religious feeling, the feeling of brotherhood among the Greeks, he turns to the separate states, and takes up the political side of his cause. For the Greeks were politically divided into small states in spite of their common feeling ;

these were hostile to one another often, and hence they had to be approached separately. How different in Asia! There the political unity swallows all, the one state, the one man, the monarch. Very soon Croesus finds the Greek states reduced to two, Athens and Sparta — Ionic and Doric.

Undoubtedly Herodotus has before himself the intense breach just preceding the Peloponnesian War, between Athens and Sparta, which breach he throws back to the time of Croesus, when the dualism had already started doubtless, but was not so pronounced. Accordingly we have the history of Athens and Sparta in the time of Croesus and before interwoven in the narrative.

(a) Athens in the time of Croesus had not unfolded into her greatness, but was in an internal struggle with her tyrants. This inner conflict was no doubt the means of her development, she had to feel the tyrannical hand before acquiring her strong spirit of freedom.

Pisistratus obtains the tyranny thrice, expelled but returning each time: first, through craft he gets the citizens to give a body-guard and then seizes the Acropolis; second, he makes the Athenians believe that the Goddess Minerva orders his restoration; third, he returns by violence and stays.

In this account we see the Athenians held in

submission, and the ruler using his chief strength to keep down the citizens. It is clear that Croesus could find but little help in them ; though the government corresponded with his own, being despotic, it was not by the will of the people. Accordingly he turns to Sparta.

(*b*) He finds that the Lacedemonians had extricated themselves out of great difficulties, and that they were internally at peace — which was not the case at Athens. From having “ the worst laws ” they had come to have the best. This was done through their great man, the law-giver Lycurgus, who was hailed by the Delphic Oracle as a God.

Hereupon we have a discussion of the well-worn theme, Spartan institutions, which have brought their people to the highest state of prosperity and strength. Then follows an attempt at conquering the Tegeans, which at first failed. Here we should notice the share of the Delphic Oracle in these matters. “ Thou askest for Arcadia, I cannot grant it thee,” but a part is given. Yet even this part has to be won by renewed effort, and the Oracle shows its double side. In order to succeed, Sparta must bring back the bones of Orestes (a sacred relic of Sparta) ; their place was at last discovered in a smithy. Here we have a fantastic tale, concerning the conquest of Tegea. When the Spartans got these bones, they were always victorious.

Indeed this conquest of Tegea by the Spartans is one of the wildest things in the whole work. They are defeated till they get the relics of a hero; compare the fact that churches were often built around the relics of a saint. Good laws come first (Lycurgus), then there must be the presence of the hero (Orestes). In such fashion the history of Athens and of Sparta is interspersed with marvelous tales to bring it down to the present. The historic fact is bad tyranny in the one state and good laws in the other; how did this fact come to be? Here the marvelous plays in, to account for the reality.

It is manifest from the present account that the relation of Sparta to the Delphic Oracle is much closer than that of Athens. In this bit of Spartan history no less than four oracular utterances are given from Delphi, while Athens has none, though the latter has its supernatural side represented in the saying of a prophet, and in allusions to Minerva. Such is the continental Greek thread, which is now first woven into the present history, and which will continue to increase in importance to the end.

(4) We are next carried into the conflict of Croesus with the East, which is represented in the person of Cyrus (71-76). We now penetrate the purpose of the Greek alliance, and of conciliating the Greek God. Croesus has seen the struggle coming on, and has prepared himself.

But just here he receives a warning from a Lydian wise man (not a Greek), advising him not to go to war with the Persian. Such is the manner of the Historian; the warning of the wise man, before the fatal enterprise, is to be duly given; Solon has already done so, and there will be many other instances hereafter. But this Lydian adviser reflects the Oriental view, and seeks to keep the two Asiatic monarchs in harmony.

Croesus succeeds in entering into an alliance with the Lacedemonians. But it is clear that he had been active in other directions. He had made a treaty of alliance with the King of Egypt and with the Babylonian King. The growing power of Cyrus had already roused the Oriental world. Croesus has constituted himself the center of opposition to Persia.

There had been an old conflict between the Lydian and Median kingdoms, which had been settled by the marriage of Astyages with the sister of Croesus. But this brother-in-law had been conquered by Cyrus, the new hero. Thus a struggle arose between Western and Central Asia, or Asia Minor and Middle Asia, the question being who shall possess the grand highway to the West and the Western World.

The battle between Croesus and Cyrus was fought at Pteria, in Cappadocia — result undecided. But Croesus concludes to return to

Lydia and Cyrus follows. Here is shown the difference between the two men — one retires and the other pursues. Sardes is besieged, again Croesus summons his allies. But his enemy is in advance ; allies so far away cannot help. The Lacedemonians do not come, having a war of their own, which, as here recounted, has a legendary touch like that of the Horatii and Curiatii. But the outcome is that Sardes is captured and Croesus is a prisoner. None of his allies appeared, Cyrus was too rapid for them.

In the present passage occurs the famous statement in which Thales, the Milesian philosopher, is said to have predicted an eclipse of the sun to the Ionians. It was the appearance of the eclipse which stopped the Orientals from a battle and caused them to make peace. The statement has roused wonder through all succeeding ages, and has been variously regarded. Was it merely a happy guess or was it based on scientific data? If the latter, Thales anticipated the modern science of astronomy in some of its most intricate calculations. Hardly any miracle recorded by Herodotus equals this. According to the reckoning of recent astronomers there were two solar eclipses in the reign of Alyattes, 610 B. C. and 584 B. C. (*Stein, Com. ad loc.*) ; some take one and some the other, for the eclipse spoken of by Herodotus. At any rate we should note that science has started in that town

of Miletus and its greatest man is the philosopher. To the same Thales is ascribed an engineering feat in the next chapter (75). With him begins also the distinctive movement of Greek philosophy,

(5) The dramatic outcome of Croesus connects him again with Solon, the philosopher. The king is a prisoner and ascends the funeral pile; thrice he repeats the name, Solon. He now realizes that happiness must wait till the end; the death of Tellus, the free Greek citizen of the free state, is far to be preferred to his own now approaching. "Listen, I name a man whose discourses all *tyrants* should hear." Still further does the Lydian contrast the philosopher with the king. What Solon had said, would apply also to Cyrus; the latter is touched with the feeling of a common humanity, "being but a man;" he commands the flames to be extinguished. This is not effected till Apollo comes and puts out the fire at the prayer for rain made by Croesus.

Yet it was this Apollo, "the God of the Greeks," who incited Croesus to make war against Cyrus. The Oracle had its share in encouraging Croesus to the contest; still the latter had his own reasons for resisting the new power rising in Central Asia. But now Croesus blames the God of the Greeks as the cause of the whole trouble. Does he see that he has

been made an instrument in the great struggle between Greece and Asia? The preliminary skirmish it is; the powers have used him and he has gone down, for which he finds fault with the Greek God.

But what will the God say in defense? This also is to be told. Croesus sends his golden fetters to Delphi, and reproaches the deity. Thus do you deceive your friends! The claim of Croesus is that the Greek spirit or the Greek God did not support him, but deceived him. Observe the several phases of the answer. (1) "The Gods cannot avoid the decrees of Fate;" so the God asserts that there is some power above the God. "I am not to blame," the God claims to have delayed the fall of Sardes three years; so the God can put off, though not change Fate. (2) The ground of this decree of Fate was the ancestral wrong in the change of dynasty, and the time for retribution had come. (3) Apollo saved the life of Croesus from the flames, sending the rainfall. (4) As to the two oracles, Croesus misunderstood both, and took his own interpretation instead of asking the God. The destruction of the great kingdom meant his own kingdom, not the Persian, and the mule on the throne was Cyrus. But the further problem, why the God responds in such riddling answers, was not explained.

Thus the historian makes the Oracle defend

itself. Still it deceived Croesus, or rather he deceived himself; he was not to be the bearer of Greek or of Oriental civilization. The World's History had the matter in hand, the victory of Croesus would have been no settlement of the great issue, rather a retardation.

Retrospect. We have now before us the Lydiad, with which Herodotus begins his account of the historic movement of his age. Moreover the conflict here portrayed is the conflict which gave birth to the historic consciousness of the race; the struggle which winds through and determines History truly begins here in a conscious way and starts to uttering itself. The war between the free Greek cities of the coast, whose principle was autonomy, and the Lydian monarch, whose principle was absolutism, produced the crisis, though Time was ready to bear the child which is henceforth to register Time's greatest doings.

Still we must recollect, that History in this epoch is but an infant, and has yet to grow through all duration. In the Orient hitherto History was not dead but unborn, struggling often in the throes of parturition—a thing of potentiality, not yet of reality. The shock which produced the consciousness of History in the movement of the race is recorded in this Lydiad before us by the “Father of History;” hence its abiding interest for the historical stu-

dent. We may summarize some of its leading points.

1. Those Greek cities of the coast had become conscious of freedom, and were fighting for it consciously, in opposition to the Oriental tendency. In the Trojan War the Greeks had essentially the same principle as these Greek cities now have, but at that time they were not conscious of it, and so could produce no History of it, the work of self-conscious Reason, but a great Poem, the work of instinctive Imagination.

2. The conception of freedom in these early Greek cities was very vague and ill-defined, and was much abused. Hardly could it be otherwise; the World's History is really a moving into a more and more complete definition of freedom. Still the individual has now become aware of himself as free, that is, as a limit-transcending spirit, who is not to have his bounds put upon him from the outside but who is to determine himself from within, whose destiny it is to be autonomous. Thus that ancient Greek man has begun to be a true individual, of human dignity; it is also clear that he will fight for his principle and thereby do a deed worthy of being recorded, as an example for all men for all time. So History must come forth now.

3. That same History must preserve the actions of the enemy who conflicts with this principle of

freedom; hence the doings of the despot will also be recorded. Croesus owes his fame to those whom he sought to subdue, and Oriental peoples and conquerors of antiquity have become historical chiefly through Greek historians and the Greek historical spirit.

4. History is born in the *Lydiad*, but it is still a child, and its child-like character must be duly appreciated, and, we think, lovingly sympathized with. It still delights in the *Marvelous Tale*, and will weave the same into the historic fact; it cannot wholly eschew the *Mythus* and the supernatural ordering of the actual world; it must have the sign, the omen, above all the oracle. Thus our Historian gives a complete picture of the consciousness of his age, in all its variegated hues; such, indeed, is his great value, if he were more strictly historical, he would be less true.

5. The artistic construction of the *Lydiad* is especially worthy of study, combining, as it does, the forward movement of History with the returning movement of the drama or Epos. The *Lydiad* is cyclical, a poetic whole, rounded off with the return of the deed to the doer; yet it is also progressive, giving the events in their successive order in Time. Herein lies the art of the Historian; he is not merely the chronicler, but also the poet; he will not be externally tied to Time and its occurrences, but he must likewise

give the inner movement which takes place in Time. Specially he must unfold the cycle of the central individual character, such as Croesus.

6. The *Lydiad* in many regards can be seen to be a movement out of the *Iliad*, out of the Epos into History. There is a distinct change from the Homeric Pantheon, the world of the Gods, as it is seen in the great poet; the deities have become more abstract, almost impersonal at times; Zeus and his Olympian family are succeeded by Fate and by Nemesis; indeed, we often catch a monotheistic tinge in the expression "the God," employed instead of the plural. Still we observe the supremacy of Apollo through his Oracle, and certainly a strong faith in the Divine Order, which the Historian is continually insisting upon, and which he deems that History specially reveals. But in general it is manifest that abstract universal principles are supplanting the personal interference of the Gods in the affairs of men — which fact again shows a movement out of the imaginative into the historical consciousness.

7. Of the two contestants in the *Lydiad*, the Asiatic Greeks and the Lydians, neither can be regarded as the adequate representative of the grand world-historical conflict which is coming on, and which is the theme of this History. Though they reveal the presence of this conflict, and play the overture in the *Lydiad*, they will

both be absorbed in the mightier contending forces which are now arising. The Asiatic Greek was too much of an Asiatic to represent the European, and so he soon falls under the Lydian; but the Lydian is himself too much of a Greek to represent the Asiatic in his struggle with Europe. Croesus hence vanishes from the stage of the World's History, and his place is taken by a new character whose career is next to be set forth in historico-dramatic fashion.

III. *PERSIAD.*

Thus we shall designate the third general part of the present Book (95-216). But the Persiad extends beyond the present Book which hardly gives more than the rise of the Persian Empire. Hence the theme which now starts will embrace the Second, Third and Fourth Books, and be continued as one of the two leading threads in the later Books. The Persiad describes the consolidation of all Western Asia under the power of Persia, preparatory to the struggle with Greece, in which the Orient is defeated. The whole, therefore, shows the rise, culmination and defeat of the Persian, wherein we see that the Lydiad is in small what the total Persiad is in large. The triple movement, growth, bloom, decay, is fundamental in Herodotus, illustrating his view of Nemesis and Fate. Still the fall of one nation is the ground for the rise of another, so that the world's progress continues, does not die with the death of one particular nation, but rather gets a fresh life.

CYRUS.—It is, however, a new hero, Cyrus, who is the central figure of the remaining portion of the present Book. Hence there is brought before us a Cyrus drama, in this Persiad, which is the new counterpart of and contrast to the preceding Croesus drama of the Lydiad. Here, too, is suggested a dramatic movement, which takes up the historical portions and organizes them into a poetic whole. We shall behold the rise, culmination and death of Cyrus, in whose tragic outcome Croesus will again appear by way of contrast. Still this calamity will not stop the work of Cyrus, whose principle we see to be the conquest and unification of the Orient under Persia. Accordingly we shall treat the rest of the present Book under the three heads just designated.

I. *Rise of Cyrus.* The historian states at the start the double nature of his theme (95): "My History proceeds next to inquire who this Cyrus was, and in what way the Persians got to be rulers of Asia." The rest of the Book is essentially an answer to the first question. But the rise of Cyrus must be given for the beginning of the account, which account embraces two nations — Media and Persia, inasmuch as the origin of Cyrus is connected with both.

The conflict with Greece always looms up in the background, still the stress of the work is to tell of Persia, and her acquisition of Asiatic domain. She will have a series of monarchs,

whose reigns will be given in succession. Lydia furnishes the example and the prelude with its list of kings. In fact, for Herodotus this seems to be the form of the Orient: a line of kings in chronological order. Very striking is the contrast to the movement of the Greek world with its many cities and struggles. The one is individualized, atomized; the other is gathered round a strong political center. The two processes are presented as going on alongside of each other, the separative and the unitary; each, too, has its own inner struggle, which, to a degree, reflects the outer struggle. That is, the Greek has his tendency toward unity, which, in the city, is the despot; but in religion it is the Oracle. Still no attempt is here made to be despot of all Greece; only an Oriental sought that. At the same time the Orientals had their movement toward freedom, separation, yet it could not be made valid. Each side thus has the total process in itself, yet with the stress in opposite directions.

The first of these Persian kings is Cyrus, hero and founder of his dynasty. Now he has to be accounted for in the antecedent time; so we have a reaching back to a line of kings of Media, four of them. The historic movement is similar to that of Lydia, which ends in Croesus; also it is similar to the Persian regal movement, which reaches to Xerxes. Here the idea of Time in successive dynasties and monarchies enters. Yet the myth-

ical plays in and colors the historical material everywhere.

1. *Media*. The Assyrians had conquered the Medes and ruled over them for 520 years, when the Medes revolted and "became free," in which expression lies a suggestion of the Greek consciousness. So we have a condition of the Medes like the Greeks, divided into a number of independent cities and communities, when Deioces makes his appearance and reduces them under a despotic government. This process is given in some detail by Herodotus, since it was an interesting matter to all Greeks.

The trouble was that the Medes had freedom, but not justice; in these communities we do not wonder at hearing that lawlessness prevailed; so it was in the Hellenic cities also. Now Deioces, being elected judge in his own village, "applied himself with great zeal to the exercise of Justice," so that he became famous among other villages. He, "keeping the sovereign power in view," just as the Greek tyrant at first would act, receives people from all parts, who came to submit their quarrels to his decision; in this way the whole country got into the habit of coming to him, and would have none else. Then he refused to continue, whereat lawlessness increased; finally the people, glad to escape from injustice, gave up their liberty and made him despot.

Here indeed is the dualism still giving trouble enough; too much freedom, too little law; individual right lapsing into wrong done to the individual. The Greek leaned to the side of liberty even at the expense of justice; the Oriental soon swept away freedom and often gave, but not always, justice. Necessarily law is one will at bottom, hence its face is toward absolutism; the political problem is to combine it with individual freedom. It was therefore natural that the Medes, Orientals as they were, should soon lapse into despotism.

At once Deioces begins to fortify and centralize his power; one city now, not many scattered ones, as the Orient has its one great imperial city. Lofty and strong walls; also a series of circles, one above another to the highest at the top of the hill-city; seven circles with the king's palace innermost; then with the seven different colors the walls are painted. Thus we have the outer symbol of classes, of castes possibly; strong social and civic divisions. Then he surrounds himself with the pompous ceremony of the Oriental despot, seeking to impress people that he is "of a different nature." So Deioces united his people and ruled over them with severe justice. In him undoubtedly the historian reflects to a degree the course of the Greek despot in Greek cities. Deioces, the first king, shows the origin of the Oriental empire — need of law.

So Persia came to be through Deioces and Cyrus.

Deioces' son Phraortes conquered the Persians; then his successor Cyaxares besieged Nineveh, when the Cimmerians, a Northern horde, made an irruption into Asia, and swept everything before it, staying for twenty-eight years. Still the Medes took Nineveh. Thus we see the Median rule extending itself, subjecting other peoples. But now there is to be a change, the Median power is to pass over to the Persian, and the man, the wonderful man, has appeared who is to accomplish it. A change of dynasty and national authority is decreed, the whole is a providential matter in contrast to human purpose. This fact is to be brought out by the marvelous tale of the birth of Cyrus, and the attempts to destroy him by his grandfather, King Astyages.

Astyages has a dream, in fact two dreams, foreshadowing what is about to happen; he orders Harpagus, a kinsman and most faithful of all the Medes, to destroy the child of his own daughter. But Harpagus hesitates to do the deed, he gives the infant to a shepherd and this shepherd is to expose it on the mountains. But the shepherd refuses to do the brutal act, and so he substitutes the dead child of his own wife, and saves the living child and brings it up as his own.

But the royal boy is discovered in one of his games, being chosen king by his playmates; the king recognizes him by his character. The Magi, the interpreters, say the time of danger is past and the boy is permitted to live; still Harpagus is punished by having his own child served up in a banquet, but this only forwards the plan by alienating Harpagus, who is now ready to revolt and help Cyrus. The outcome is that Cyrus gets to be king and rules over Medes and Persians.

The great stress of the Tale is to show the providential side against all the contrary plans of men. The thing decreed will fulfill itself. Thus is suggested an order above the will of the individual, be it considered as a blind Fate or as an ordering Providence. Here the historian seems to seize the spirit of History (World-Spirit) as realizing itself in the case of Cyrus, as there is no word or oracle of the Gods, which pre-determines the event. Astyages is the instrument himself; in seeking to prevent, he brings about the very occurrence. Hence he is the man of Fate.

Many are the relations of this story; we think of the exposure of Romulus suckled by a wolf, or by the shepherdess whose name was *Lupa*. So here some said that Cyrus was suckled by a bitch, or by a woman whose name was *Cyno* (meaning bitch), as the historian puts it. The modern

mythologist of a certain school sees here the primitive belief that man was reared or sprung of lower animals. Its similiarity to the Oedipus legend is also striking. For Laius, like Astyages, undertakes to expose the fateful child, and brings about the fulfillment of the oracle. Then the Thyestean banquet plays in — the serving up of the cooked child to the parent in revenge.

The consciousness which creates such a legend feels the unusual element in the Great Man, and elevates it into the supernatural, which in a sense it is, being above the general level of humanity, and showing the providential order over the ordinary. Yet the historic element therein is not wanting; at certain junctures the world-historical spirit takes a hand; this spirit Herodotus feels, even when he clothes it in a mythical garb.

2. *Persia*. Thus the Median kingdom passes over into the Persian through the instrumentality of the Great Man who is indeed the miracle. He will continue the work he has begun, which is to unify Western Asia.

The Persians as well as the Medes belonged to the Aryan race; they, under their new leader, will descend into the great river valley of the Euphrates and Tigris and there subdue another race, the Semitic, which has had hitherto the chief influence in Western Asia. The historian makes the Persians in their customs (131-9) a kind of

primitive, idyllic people, and doubtless suggested to Xenophon the idea of his romance, the *Cyropaedia*. Still it may be observed that some signs of degeneracy are manifested. From the age of five years their sons are instructed in three things only: to ride, to use the bow, and to speak the truth. A further consideration of the Persian state and character will come later.

II. *Culmination of Cyrus* (141-200). In these chapters the historian brings before us the conqueror Cyrus fulfilling his mission. He is shown breaking down two great limits to his Oriental sway. In the first place he subjugates the Greek cities of the coast through his lieutenants and thereby unifies Asia Minor under his rule; thus the Asiatic Aryans of the West are his. In the second place the Babylonian Empire of the great river valley (of the Euphrates) he conquers, which is inhabited in the main by Semitic peoples. Cyrus is herein seen consolidating the two main races of Western Asia into one vast Empire.

1. *The Greek Thread* (141-177). This the historian picks up again, after having dropped it for a good while (70), in order to develop the Oriental Thread in the Lydian and Median conquests. These two Threads wind through the entire History, and the student should note when one is left off and the other is resumed; also the different style of each is to

be scanned; in the main the Greek Thread is more historical, the Asiatic more legendary. First is the complete subjection of Asia Minor, when the narrative returns to Middle Asia. Again we observe the strong contrast of Greek with Oriental; the Greek world is a series of small cities (no Nineveh or Babylon is among them), refusing to concentrate beyond a certain point. Then these cities are in a conflict with the Orient for external freedom, also in an internal conflict between one another and between classes and parties. Their principle is difference, separation, individuation.

The first division is the three Greek tribes, Aeolians, Ionians, Dorians, with their respective cities. Not one great metropolis, but twelve towns in Aeolis, and six for the Dorians. Not only would the three Greek tribes not unite, but each tribe would not take into membership other communities of the same tribe; Ionians exclude Ionians, Dorians exclude Dorians.

And yet we witness faint attempts at union. The Ionians had a Panionium, a religious union for common worship of the Ionic cities glorying in the name which seemed to other Greeks a reproach. Or does Herodotus, a Dorian, let a touch of tribal or local prejudice appear in this place, a Dorian contempt for the Ionian? But this religious unity seems never to have risen into a political unity, the jealousy was too great.

It is interesting to note that the idea of confederation with its twofold principle, union on one side and local self-government on the other, had suggested itself to the thinkers and statesmen of Ionia before the present trouble. Of these the greatest was Thales. Exceedingly suggestive, indeed prophetic is the passage (see it in c. 170). That is, Thales had proposed to have a council at Teos, on an island and at the center of Ionia; this council doubtless was to have certain political powers, and the states were to be independent (autonomous). So we have a primitive Greek presentiment of the United States. This idea foreshadowed in Asia will never afterwards wholly die; it will reappear in old Greece in various forms, of which the most important will be the Achæan League; it will move through History till it crosses the Ocean and there finds realization. Thales, then, sent the winged thought on its flight down Time; himself not a Greek wholly, but with Semitic blood in his veins, a cosmopolitan; surely the greatest figure appearing in these times.

Such were the Ionians; the Dorian cities to the South showed in general the same tendencies. They too had a common religious festival to Triopean Apollo. The Dorians manifest the same spirit of exclusiveness toward their own, "taking care not to admit any of the neighboring Dorians." Herodotus speaks of the expul-

sion of his own city Halicarnassus from this league on account of a violation of a sacred custom by a citizen.

The twelve cities of the Aeolians on the continent follow the example of the Ionians and submit to the Persian; the islanders who are Aeolians remain free (Lesbos and Tenedos). It is clear from this that Ionians took the lead. Here, too, we observe that Lesbian did not spare Lesbian, but enslaved him; Arisba is subjected by Methymnae. Then note how ungrateful the exiled Colophonians acted toward Smyrna, which had received them. No wonder the Greek cities were suspicious and jealous of one another.

Now what will these Greek people do in their emergency? Send ambassadors to Sparta, which was evidently looked upon as the great supporter and defender of Greek spirit — not to Athens, which is still under tyranny. Ionians likewise send to Sparta. The Phocaeans speak; Pythermus shows the most spirit of all these Ionians in opposition to the Persian (Miletus had come to terms). But the Spartans would not help the Ionians openly, yet they sent word to Cyrus not to injure any Greek city. Cyrus taunts them, and threatens, but events call him back to Persia.

The conquest of the Greek cities, however, goes on under lieutenants of Cyrus; the heroic people in this struggle are the Phocaeans, whose courage is duly celebrated by the historian, who

mentions their long voyages as far as Spain, and their settlement in Sardinia. The Teians also acted in nearly the same way, similar to Athens later. But the Persian was too strong; even the islanders at last submitted in terror.

What was to be done? Bias, the wise man, of Priene, advised colonization, the Ionians should go to Sardinia and there rule, holding under sway a large island by means of their ships. But that was not written in their destiny. Another people, world-historical, was rising in the West; the Greeks were not to rule in Hesperia. But they now have almost completed their function in the World's History, these Asiatic Greeks; they will never again mean to the world or to themselves what they now mean. They have had their time; the World-Spirit, moving westward, settled down in these cities for a while but is preparing to pass on.

The Ionians and Aeolians are conquered and incorporated in the Persian army. The Persian general next subjects the more barbarous peoples, the remaining contingent of earlier tribes — Carians, Caunians, Lycians, of whom the historian gives some details.

The Greek cities of the coast are now subjugated to Persia, and some on the islands have submitted; thus there is a unification of all Asia Minor under Persia, which has asserted the imperial principle of the Orient. Asia Minor

was a mass of many cities, tribes and peoples in a condition of conflict — Semites and Aryans evidently intermingled. We note (1) the Greek cities of the coast; (2) the backward tribes of the Hellenic stock, Pelasgic (Carians, Caunians, etc.); (3) the nations under kings, Lydia, Phrygia, etc. All these are swallowed up into the Orient, the period of separation is ended. Now Asia Minor belonged to Asia, yet the Greek cities brought over or generated the new principle of the Occident, which is at present suppressed in this country.

Most distinctly has the historic battle between Orient and Occident opened along this coast; the present outcome is defeat of the West on this Eastern soil. Every Greek who at this time crosses to Asia is not free. We may see in it the discipline of the Greeks, though external; they have to obey a unity now, a central authority outside their own city.

Still the Oriental sway of the Persian is not without opposition among the Orientals. The semi-hellenized Lydians are ready to revolt under Pactyas (154) as soon as Cyrus departs for home, "since Babylon was in his way, and the Bactrians and the Sacæ, as well as the Aegyptians." Thus the conqueror is seen struggling with his boundaries in every direction. The Lydian revolt, however, is soon suppressed, and the ringleader is captured, after fleeing from one

Greek city to another for protection, being torn from a sanctuary and delivered up by the Chians for a reward. An anecdote accounts for the rapid degeneracy of the Lydians; they are forbidden to have weapons of war, and are required "to wear tunics under their cloaks and buskins on their feet;" moreover, the rising generation is taught to play on the cithara and to sell by retail; thus "from men they shall quickly become women." But the Lydians have simply followed the general law of Oriental peoples: a hardy, uncivilized nation is unified within under a great leader, it conquers the neighboring civilized nations, and passes with them into effeminacy and final subjugation. The Persians, the present conquerors, will verify the same law.

2. *The Oriental Thread* (177-201). The historian makes a distinction between Lower Asia (Asia Minor) and Upper Asia; to this last Cyrus devoted himself, "subduing every tribe and letting none go." But the account of these conquests is omitted, with the exception of two or three cases.

Nor will the historian here give any record of the Assyrian kings. Only the queens will he mention, Semiramis and Nitocris, both of whom constructed useful works. The memory of Nitocris is specially celebrated by Herodotus, who probably beheld in his travels some of the works ascribed to her. As usual he spins around

the fact a garment of romance ; he accounts for the actual through the mythical.

The description of Babylon is that of a vast Oriental city, and is in the strongest contrast to the small Greek city. A centralized power is shown in every part ; an unlimited control of human labor ; an attempt to bar out the enemy by walls, of which two, one inside the other, encompass the city, doubtless with much spare land inside not covered by buildings and used for tillage in case of a siege. More than 200 square miles of land lay within these walls, which were 200 cubits high (over 300 feet). Naturally the correctness of these figures of Herodotus has been questioned (see Rawlinson's Herodotus, *ad loc*). This Babylonian work has been estimated to contain nearly double the cubic contents of the great wall of China, which is 1,200 miles long, 20 to 25 feet high, 15 to 20 feet broad.

Thus the historian brings before his countrymen the Oriental idea of colossality. The Greek structure was comparatively small, such as the acropolis, the temple ; even the so-called Cyclopean masonry with its huge blocks of stone incloses a very limited space at Mycenae and Tiryns. But the Greek had the idea of proportion, not of hugeness, which was to him barbaric. Moderation is his well-known principle ; a little town was his political unit, not an immense empire.

Doubtless the historian, Greek that he was, refused to insert at this point the long annals of Assyrian monarchs, as it would throw his narrative out of proportion, making it unwieldy with a vast mass of Oriental matter. So he cuts short the account of the conquests of Cyrus in the East, lest it be disproportionate to the Greek or Western thread of his History.

The walls of Babylon, though so immense, do not, however, keep out the foe. The Babylonians retired within the inclosure, expecting external protection; they even engaged in a festival during the siege. Cyrus deflected the river which ran through the city and entered the latter along the bed of the stream. There was no stout defense on the part of the people, no heroic deeds of valor such as were often witnessed in Greece. Why should there be? The people were essentially slaves, they had nothing to fight for, one despot was as good as another; indeed they were not unwilling probably to change masters for a while. So it is with so many of these Oriental conquests: the rulers only are changed; the tribute, otherwise the same, passes into new hands. When these rulers become enervated by luxury, they are violently shoved aside by a new set young and vigorous, till these in turn become enervated.

This rich plain is the condition of civilization on the one hand and of effeminacy on the other.

What the Babylonian eats is mainly the gift of nature; what the Greek eats is mainly the product of his own labor on an unkindly soil. The yield of corn on the Assyrian lands is prodigious to a Greek mind; but there are no trees (except the cultivated palm), no produce of the fig, vine and olive. A dead uniformity of toil in the one case; in the other a variety of work, coupled with skill, foresight, versatility. In like manner in Greece there is a varied scenery, mountain, valley, sea; in Babylonia the level prairie.

When we pass from land to water, there is a similar contrast. What a difference between a sail on the Euphrates and on the Aegæan! The Oriental floats like his vessel down the river, carried to his destination by an external power; the current bears him on, and he is dependent or resigned. Such is his religion; so he gets to the Capital and so he gets to Heaven. But the Greek sailor (and most of the Greeks had something of the sailor in their fiber through experience with sea, which borders on every Greek province except one — Arcadia) must be self-determined, self-reliant in his little craft on the waves and in the winds of the Greek waters. Such is the different training which nature, the first teacher, gives to these two different peoples.

The ethical contrast between the two peoples is seen in the customs relative to virginity and marriage. The abominations of Babylon have

become proverbial through the prophetic denunciations of the Old Testament, for all time that city will be known as the harlot and the scarlet woman. Moreover, we may note here a contrast between the Jew and the Greek looking at the same social phenomenon; the one is the fiery moral preacher and prophet, the other is the observer, impartial, quite calm, though he too breaks out into disapproval at "the most shameless custom of the Babylonians", the woman's offering of herself in the temple of the Goddess Mylitta (199).

The activity of the mythical spirit we may observe in what is said Cyrus did to the river Gyndes (189). Because it drowned one of the sacred white horses which plunged into it, he is said to have divided it into three hundred and sixty small channels, making "its stream so weak that women henceforth shall cross it without wetting their knees." A strain of insolence is thus ascribed to Cyrus, such as we shall hereafter see manifested by Xerxes. But there is hardly a doubt that these channels were cut for the purpose of irrigation, and were probably connected with the sun, one for every day of the the year. Legend undertakes to account for the fact and connects it with the Persian hero, in his great enterprise against Babylon. Such an outburst of caprice and passion is characteristic of the Oriental monarch, yet shows his power.

III. *Defeat and death of Cyrus.* This is the third act of the Cyrus drama, taking place after the culmination of his career in the conquest of Asia Minor and Babylon. We have noted that Cyrus, like the Oriental conqueror in general, frets against all external limits, he cannot endure a boundary to his country or to himself. He will be universal, not from within, through mind, but from without, through a continual annulment of physical limitations. So he gets annulled himself in his physical limitation.

To the North and Northeast of Persia lay a vast territory, which bounded his Empire, and which he determined to make his own. There dwelt the Massagetae, generally supposed to be the ancestors of the Goths, Teutons, perchance our own forefathers in their barbarous period. They were under a queen Tomyris; it is curious to see how Herodotus brings into the foreground these queens of the Orient; in which connection we should remember that his own city, Halicarnassus, during his life, had a queen, Artemisia, who also distinguished herself in war.

The Cyrus drama now falls into dialogue. The queen bids the Persian king desist from his attempted conquest: "you rule over your dominions, and bear to see me rule over mine." So said Tomyris, really voicing a Greek view of the situation; but Cyrus the Oriental could not bear to see her ruling over her own; thus there is a

limit to his land and to his authority. Then she challenges him to fight, whereby Croesus is introduced giving his opinion, which is a warning to Cyrus that he is a man and not an immortal (hence he should respect the limits of the finite being), and that there is "a cycle in human affairs," which does not permit the same man to be always successful. After thus rebuking the fatuity of the Persian monarch, Croesus suggests a stratagem, which Cyrus follows, winning the victory and capturing the queen's son who at the first chance slays himself through shame at his capture.

A second battle takes place in which Cyrus is slain, and his body falls into the hands of Tomyris. Then occurs the tragic nemesis in a most striking passage. Queen Tomyris plunges his severed head into a skin filled with human blood, saying, "I shall glut thee with blood as I threatened."

Thus retribution has come and the Cyrus drama closes. He dashes himself to pieces against the outer bounds of his world, against the barbarous limit. Darius will do the same thing later against Scythia on the North, and just escape with his life; Xerxes will throw himself upon the Hellenic boundary, and be driven back defeated. Persia has begun to find her limits already in the time of Cyrus; still more she will come upon them in her later history.

Thus the Cyrus drama is a tragedy in contrast with the Croesus drama. Cyrus subdues, slays, till he gets his own deed back; Croesus is transformed by his misfortune internally, is converted to Solon, and is saved at the last moment. Solon's is, therefore, the saving view of the world, the view which eradicates insolence (*authadia*) and thereby preserves the individual from the stroke of retribution. Some such thought underlies these two dramas of the First Book, with their different outcomes.

OBSERVATIONS ON BOOK FIRST.

The structural principle of the present Book has shown itself, we hope, in the preceding exposition. Two great characters are seized and are portrayed in a cycle of development — Croesus and Cyrus — which produces the feeling of an artistic whole in each case. But into this cycle of a great individual the historic movement of the epoch is interwoven, whose events are chronicled in the order of time. Thus from the standpoint of structure there is a complete interfusion of poetry and history, peculiar to our historian. But as yet the poetic dominates the historical, though the former be moving into the latter.

The contents correspond; the historian does not hesitate to introduce the supernatural, the mythical, the oracular, the fictitious, more particularly when he wishes to set forth the controlling order of things, the providential element which gleams through events. Herodotus has

the conception of a World-History, indistinct yet at work. The counterpart of the Homeric Gods is in him, yet in a state of transformation.

I. *The Delphic Oracle.* Some things can be explained about the Delphic Oracle and some can not; when the mystery is interpreted, it is no longer a mystery; when the Oracle is made over into the terms of the understanding, it is no longer oracular. We can, however, make clear in a certain degree the consciousness of which such a phenomenon is the expression.

1. Imagine a people divided into a thousand distinct communities without any political bond of authority, yet with a feeling of unity in race, language, customs, religion, in fact with a feeling of a great common destiny and of oneness of spirit — and we have the general sphere of the Oracle. It has no such sphere in the Orient, with the one authoritative, absolute ruler, who must be himself the Oracle for his people; the Hebrew prophet was not an Oracle, though both shared in the prophetic consciousness. Note that the *Lydiad* is full of oracular utterances which quite disappear in the *Cyrus* drama, except in the Greek thread, though there is the prophetic dream. The Oracle, therefore, performs a distinct function for its people, the Hellenic, and even reaches over into semi-Hellenic and barbarous peoples with its influence.

2. The Oracle sought to preserve the unity of

the Greek stock by promoting internal peace among jealous and combative communities. It would not permit, for instance, its favorite Sparta to absorb Arcadia (66). It worked through sentiment and religion, not through political authority, which it had to keep shy of in the main. Religion must influence politics indirectly.

3. It favored and united the Greek against the Barbarian, though the latter also came to the sanctuary with rich presents. In the main, but not without some ambiguity, it supported the Occident against the Orient. The case of Croesus is an instance.

4. It promoted colonization in the interest of the Greek race against the barbarous world, and in the interest of the inner peace of cities, which often had to get rid of one of two political leaders, and send him off to found a colony.

5. Such an Oracle was sure to be asked about matters concerning which it had no business to give a response — matters special, personal, not of universal import. Yet it had to answer, or recognize its own limit, or the limit of the God. The result was it took refuge in ambiguity, obscurity, riddle, cunning, quackery, charlatanism. Such was the outcome of the whole oracular business in Greece, and the Oracles at last became dumb because they had nothing true to utter. But this corruptible strain was in them from the beginning.

6. We still inquire about the procedure in getting the oracular utterance. Out of a fissure in the earth over which stood a tripod, rose a sort of exhalation (supposed to produce a kind of trance or ecstasy when breathed). Upon this tripod the priestess (the Pythia) took her seat, came under the influence, and muttered incoherent words, which were taken down by men present and put into hexameters usually, which the consultor received as his response.

The numerous points involved in this process cannot be discussed. There is a psychical question in regard to the Pythia — mesmeric, magnetic, mediumistic, theosophic; this we shall at once let drop. But the intermediate set of men, the college of priests or the committee who framed the oracles — what shall we say to them? We shall have to grant them the shaping influence, be it of wisdom, folly, cunning; they were often wise, must have often been in great doubt, but in the main were Pan-Hellenic.

7. The locality at Delphi is impressive, Nature herself has the Delphic hint. The Greek required this outer suggestion, he was extremely sensitive to the still small voice of environment, his poetical bent led him to blend nature and spirit into one harmony. He would undertake no enterprise without the favorable omen; he required the external whisper from his surroundings before he would act in an important matter.

He could not as yet wholly determine himself within himself. So he demanded an oracular statement as his starting-point; so too this oracular statement at Delphi required the murmur or the raving of the Pythia as its starting-point; not till then could the college of priests frame the response out of their own view of the circumstances. They must first be impelled from without, then they can act from within.

They reflected something like our public opinion. How does the Greek world feel about Croesus? Can it make any real alliance with an Oriental despot who has enslaved Greek cities? The Delphic instinct (Delphi was called the *omphalos*, the navel) must have felt the question as well as the response of all Hellas, and yet it must be very circumspect, indeed ambiguous toward the great Asiatic power.

In such cases we can recognize the sphere of presentiment and prophecy. "The soul has a prophetic element," says Plato; it is continually giving out the note of anticipation. Especially is the undeveloped, prehistoric soul in this condition; it is like the child whose play foreshadows the future man and even the future institutional world which he is growing into. So too the Oracle has a play element, spontaneous, premonitory; it is a child utterance of a natural soul in its child epoch, which passes away with the growth of the self-conscious reason.

II. *Orientalism and Hellenism.* The reader of Herodotus is always seeking to formulate for himself the difference between the Orient and Greece, as this is the grand dualism from which arises not only the present History, but History in general and the historic consciousness. We must often repeat that on the Greco-Asiatic line herein laid down the great conflict between East and West took place, with which conflict History opens and the conception of History, and which calls forth the man, living in this district, and both seeing and sharing in the conflict, who is to record the fact.

1. In the Family, which is the basis of all institutional life, the Persian and the Oriental generally is polygamous; the Greek and the Occidental generally is monogamous. Thus the Eastern husband is a domestic despot, mild though he may be; he takes a new wife when he wants one, and she cannot exact from him the same unity of love and devotion which she is required to manifest toward him. The caprices and passions of the despot have a starting-point in the domestic circle.

2. In the State the Oriental ruler is absolute and the subject is a slave, in contrast with the free Greek citizen. Authority belongs to the Orient, freedom to the Occident. Throughout the present History this difference is set forth. To be sure, it cannot be affirmed that the Greeks

were wholly free (they had slaves), or that they had the complete conception of freedom. It is a well-known statement of the philosopher Hegel that in the Oriental world one man was free, in the Greek world some men were free, in the Modern world all men are free.

3. In the Orient there is the tendency to consolidation through conquest; in Greece is the counter principle of autonomy for each community. Herein each side is an extreme; between the two lies the golden mean; in the one case unity runs into despotism; in the other, individuality runs into selfishness and anarchy.

4. Along the same line of thought we see that the Orient in its artistic expression seeks magnitude, while the Greek aims at proportion.

5. In the physical features of the Orient and Hellas we can trace the suggestion of the difference in their spirit. The one is very large, the other very small; the one has great river valleys and plains in which civilization begins; the other is divided up and diversified in every part by mountain, sea, little streams and valleys. The Greek was mountaineer, lowlander, sailor, all in one; nature would not permit him to sink into the uniformity of the Orient

6. The nations of Western Asia are not fully historical, yet are by no means devoid of a history; we may call them semi-historical. There are long lists of kings, with accounts of con-

quests and rebellions; but that does not make History in its Occidental sense. Writing there is on brick and stone, records of some monarch, yet no transferable history appealing to the individual; little or no account of great national deeds, nationality as well as individuality being quite sunk in the one man, the monarch. War seems to settle mainly one thing: Which of the two despots shall rule? The people remain pretty much the same whoever rules. History deals with national life, which is in the Orient, but is not yet explicit.

7. Why this continual desire of conquest in the Orient? The Oriental spectacle is a never-ending series of rising and falling empires; why cannot these nations endure one another, and exist side by side together, as in modern Europe? The Oriental State cannot recognize the neighbor State as a State, as itself in fact; there is but one State, one ruler, one authority. The external limit to itself it cannot make internal, and thus transcend the same; it must break down the limit from the outside.

The Oriental does not know what to do with individuality, and hence seeks to destroy it or violently to repress it. This individual State appears with its limit against the Persian State; thus it confines and so far controls the Persian spirit, which marches forward to remove the limit to itself. For all spirit, Oriental too, is

inherently limit-transcending, though in very different ways. In the United States each State recognizes the other to be just what it is, having the same rights in all things; thus the State limit is really no limit of exclusion, and the States are truly united and form one Nation. Just the reverse was the Oriental consciousness, which had as yet hardly a glimmer of such a recognition. Hence it could transcend its limit only though breaking down the same by force, by a negative act. But the return of such an act was inevitable; every nation in destroying a nation, is destroying itself. Hence the monotonous series of rises and falls of empires in the Orient.

Just as little can the Orient recognize the individual man in his freedom as it can the individual State, and for the same general reason. Such a man would be a limit to the ruler; to the single will other wills must be made nought. The Oriental ruler is the law,—yet not the written law, which would again be a limit. The East has had lawgivers, but they are exceptional in a despotic world. The true lawgiver, in whom the law separates itself from the person, is Greek, is Solon, Lycurgus; finally the lawgiver must personally vanish in the law, and not be known as an individuality; note, for example, the Roman Law, in which Jurisprudence attains its pure universality, being evolved, not from one

brain, but from a nation, and that nation too the universal ruler and lawgiver.

8. With Persia, however, development begins, history connects it with Greece and the Occident, and the historic continuity starts, which has not since been seriously interrupted.

Persia simply held together the subject peoples, did not transform them, they were the same in religion, customs and character as before. An external bond of power suppressed war between countries and allowed a certain inner unfolding. But the Greeks had the inner bond of race, religion, and spirit, though they lacked the more external bond, or political union. The Persian worshiped light; he was to a degree the light which shone on Western Asia, made all its distinctions manifest, and left them as they were. The Persian army, as we shall see in the expedition of Xerxes, was a vast aggregate — men of the sea, men of the plain, men of the mountain; an aggregate of races also — Aryan, Semitic, Turanian. No political limit is allowed; all other distinctions are not interfered with. The war will show that the Greek cannot be subsumed under this external aggregation.

III. *Thales and Miletus.* Of both we have already spoken, but they deserve repeated mention and thought. Of the cities of the Asiatic coast, Miletus stood far in advance as regards the arts, commerce, civilization, though the people

of the small city of Phocaea were the most heroic. A wonderful development had taken place in Miletus, which apparently culminated about the time of Croesus, or a little before. It was a sea-faring town, and so could defy the attempts of the Lydian kings from the land; still it had also its territory and its agriculture. It was a center of trade, of manufactures, specially; of navigation; art and poetry were not wanting but particularly natural science flourished among a people who traded in the physical products of separated countries. Geography must have had a good start ere Anaximines, a Milesian, could have constructed the first map. History, too, had begun in Miletus; probably the most distinguished precursor of Herodotus was Hecataeus, one of its citizens. Astronomy necessarily follows in the wake of navigation; the sailor will have to study the stars.

There is no doubt that politics flourished in Miletus, as in all these Greek towns. The leaning was toward democracy, yet with other tendencies. Political speculation probably began in Miletus; its citizens had started to think and to philosophize, the three forms of government — democracy, aristocracy, monarchy were seen in the countries about them, and had supporters in the city, which had in its own history more or less experience of the democrat, the tyrant and the

aristocrat. Herodotus in a well-known passage projects a Greek discussion of these three forms of government into the heart of Persia (III. 80-82).

But the most striking and important political idea which can be traced to Miletus is that which is ascribed to Thales (I. 170), and which receives the commendation of our Historian, though he introduces it in a merely casual manner. Thales "who was of Phoenician extraction," advised the separate Ionic cities "to constitute one general council in the central place of Ionia (which was Teos), but the cities were to remain independent as before," each with its own local government. Here is distinctly the idea of a constitutional confederacy of States into which our modern world is just beginning to enter, and which is the government of the future. Still this idea made its appearance among those Ionic cities of Asia Minor some 600 years B. C., being called forth by the necessities of their situation.

Thales is manifestly the great man of the epoch, not, however, the great man of action, but the thinker. These cities did not produce any supreme, all-dominating man of action, like Themistocles, like Alexander. But a mighty intellectual force was manifested in Thales. Already we have spoken of his prediction of the eclipse, which is supposed to have taken place in the reign of Alyattes, father of Croesus, during a

war between the Lydians and the Medes (I. 74). Thus the consciousness which underlies physical science had been born. Thales looked upon nature as the expression of law, not as the plaything of divine caprice; otherwise he could not have calculated the eclipse. With him at least the mythical has passed into the scientific stage, or the beginning thereof. In a parallel manner we have noticed the mythical passing into the historical stage, which sees the deed as it is, not as determined by a supernatural power. Science and History have thus made their start in Miletus, springing from a common consciousness.

But the chief fame of Thales is yet to be mentioned: he is celebrated as the first Greek philosopher; his is the first great name in that discipline, whose essence is thought, and which is still working in undiminished energy down to this day. Thales asked the question: What is the principle of all things? The great advance is that man could ask such a question, whatever be the answer. Thought is seeking to think itself as the primal essence, and philosophy begins. This may be likewise considered to be a grand step out of the Orient to the Occident, especially at this early day. Indeed the Orient has hardly yet philosophy in the Occidental sense; all philosophy has a tendency there to become theosophy, the nature of which is rather

religious or mythological than philosophical. Thales, however, makes the grand spirit-step (*dreifach merkwürdiger Geisterschritt*), and lands himself in the science of all sciences (*scientia omnium scientiarum*), in that old Greek town of Miletus. The History of Philosophy, accordingly, starts with him and his Ionic School, and records the movement of Thought trying to think Thought as the principle of the Universe, in an unbroken line of names down to the present.

The answer of Thales to his own question is also worthy of being noted here, as it is characteristic of his time and of his city. He said that the universal principle of things is *water*; man has to think *water* as the true essence. We have already noted how the sea is everywhere in Greece, and enters into Greek life and character. The sea in those old times was the realm of freedom, which neither the Lydian nor the Persian was able to fetter. The sea gave to Miletus its importance and independence, rendering it for a long period inexpugnable against the Oriental. The mastery of the sea was indeed the grand new mastery, which finally in the hands of the Athenians overwhelmed the Persian, and rescued Europe. The old philosopher of Miletus, looking out from the shore upon the sea, and beholding the going and returning ships

of his city, may well have felt a strong attachment — he must have been a sailor too — for water. Seeing before him the numberless islands of the Aegæan floating, as it were, in the water, he would naturally recall the Homeric conception of an Ocean stream, in which the whole earth might be floating. Thus water is the all-holding, the boundless which everywhere bounds, the infinite limiting the finite, the one thing out of which all things flow.

Such we may conceive to have been some of the early struggles of Thought — seeking to get back to itself through a form of the external world. Another characteristic we may mention here: water is the formable, ever suggesting forms to the imagination — Tritons, Nereids, Mermaids; it thus caught the Greek plastic sense. Art fixes these fluid forms which, however, are first suggested by the fluid water. (See the use to which Goethe has put Thales and the water philosophy in the Second Part of *Faust*, Act II.)

Such must have been the intellectual activity in ancient Miletus nearly 2500 years ago, antedating that of Athens and continental Hellas by a century at least. The starting-point of the Occident with its new idea we may place here, in its conscious form; this idea seems to have gotten distinctly aware of itself in Miletus and its philosopher. The struggle with Lydia was indeed prolific;

the conflict with that Oriental people called forth the intellectual beginning of the Occident; here we catch glimpses of the birth of History, Science, Philosophy, all of them specifically Occidental disciplines.

The Phœnician cities were sea-faring, commercial, colonizing as well as the Greek (Miletus alone is said to have planted eighty colonies). Tyre and Sidon must have been active intellectually, but they did not reveal their knowledge; they have left behind themselves no History, Science, or Philosophy.

IV. *Antecedents of Herodotus.* Note again that Herodotus begins his History with the conflict which called forth the historic consciousness of the Occident; that is, he begins his History with the beginning of History in its Occidental sense. This conflict took place about one hundred years before his own time. The intervening period produced many incipient forms of writing, which go to make History, and which contributed also to the making of Herodotus. The most important of these antecedent classes of writers we may designate.

1. The mythographer, who sought to bring the Greek mythical world — gods, demi-gods, and heroes — into some kind of an ordered whole. The understanding, no longer myth-creating, reduces the vast mass of transmitted mythical material into a system of which the

work of Apollodorus may be taken as a sample. Herodotus has this tendency also; see the opening chapters of the First Book, as well as his attempt to bring into harmony the Greek and the Egyptian Pantheon in the Second Book.

2. Ethnography, the description of tribes and nations by travelers; several such works had been written before the time of Herodotus, who was himself a great traveler, and whose History devotes much space to accounts of barbarous, Greek, and Oriental peoples.

3. Geography, the description of the physical earth and its products. A commercial city, like Miletus, must have found this science a necessary help to its trade. Hecataeus, the Milesian, a predecessor of Herodotus, wrote a book, which was doubtless chiefly geographical, and which is cited by our Historian.

4. Chroniclers had already appeared before Herodotus and had recorded events in succession, putting stress upon the time element of affairs. Hence arose the need of a chronological standard. Chronology is not very distinct in Herodotus, since he has no era or universal measurer of historic time. Each country took for such a purpose its own line of rulers, and each city its list of magistrates. But the question must rise in History, what rulers and events are cotemporaneous? At last Greece found a canon in the Olympiad, but Herodotus does not employ it,

though he has his way of indicating what is successive and what is synchronous.

5. Herodotus has taken these afore-mentioned elements into his History, which is, however, something altogether distinct from each of them and from all of them together. We shall find in him the Mythus, the historical event in time, a description of lands and of peoples; but there comes just that which makes his book unique — its conception and organization. There is, first of all, that wonderful artistic sense, which has already been dwelt upon in treating of this First Book with its *Lydiad* and *Persiad*; but the whole work shows the same constructive power, accompanied by dramatic vividness and skill in drawing characters. His History is thrown into the form of recording a great collision, whose spiritual principle is the heart of the entire action, which unfolds itself and orders itself from beginning to end, making the whole a vast work of art that includes many dramas.

V. *Personal relation of the Historian to the First Book.* We often ask ourselves in the course of the present narrative, What were the sources of the Historian's information, about Lydia and about Persia, for instance? There were native Lydian chroniclers whom he doubtless consulted; he also refers to the learned among the Persians for his authority in certain cases. But the main source of his statements is "inquiry,"

which is the original meaning of the word History.

The chief scene of the occurrences of the present Book is laid in the western part of Asia Minor, in the Historian's own home, as it were; the incidents pertaining to Croesus he must have often heard, from his childhood on; tradition had woven around the Lydian king the web of fact and fable, which the Historian has here ordered. The materials were given, but his is the organizing hand, the architectonic soul. Herodotus had lived through the great conflict of Greece with Xerxes; he saw the germ of the same conflict in the war of Croesus with the Greek cities of the Asiatic coast; he recognized the same principle in both and made it the creative idea of his entire History.

The stay of the Historian at Athens (somewhere in middle life) shows its influence in the present Book. It may well be doubted if he reached fully the depth of his great conception, till he had come into contact with Athenian spirit. Athens had done the grand deed, and knew it; that is, Athens had shown the mightiest will-power in resisting Oriental domination, and was well aware of the meaning of the struggle. To will-power she added thought-power; Herodotus saw her in the very bloom of her intellectual greatness, in the age of Pericles, when she had become self-conscious in art, in

poetry, and especially in philosophy, which is just the self-knowing discipline.

On the other hand no Athenian wrote or could write the history of the Persian War, and transmit the historic record of Athens' greatest glory. It needed an outsider, free from the partizanship and enmity of the continental Greeks; it needed a man who could feel and trace the beginning of the conflict in the struggle of the Asiatic Greeks with the Lydian monarch. No Athenian could know much of this matter, and would not be likely to attach much importance to it, if he knew it. So Herodotus, an Asiatic Greek, yet absorbing the Athenian spirit, was the chosen man to make the complete and impartial record for all time. Another reminiscence of the stay of Herodotus at Athens is the use he makes of the Athenian lawgiver and philosopher, Solon, in the present Book. To the Athenians of the age of Pericles, when Herodotus was in Athens, the name of Solon was revered as the father of the Athenian democracy; Solon was the man who resisted the tyranny of Peisistratus on the one hand, and reduced the wild populace to law on the other, thereby seeking to unite liberty with authority. Thus Solon lived and deserved to live in the hearts of the people; but he had another distinction: he was a philosopher, the man who had begun to think universally. A poet, too, he

was, of the gnostic kind. Now this Athenian of the aforesaid Herodotus brings into the age and presence of Croesus, in order to contrast the two opposite states of consciousness, the Athenian and the Asiatic, each giving his view of the matter called human life. Our historian, accordingly, makes Athens, in the person of her great citizen, the bearer of the Greek Idea versus the Oriental, long before Marathon and Salamis. Such a view, we may well hold, was the fruit of his stay at Athens, and forms a kind of prelude to his entire History.

Many indications we have of his travels in the present Book. He remained at Delphi quite a while and studied its monuments and offerings; they were indeed valuable historic documents. A stay at Delphi also we have the right to suppose; deeply sympathetic he shows himself to be with its spirit of which he drank at its fountain-head. The result is, a Delphic thread is woven through his whole History, from beginning to end. He could hardly have obtained so much knowledge of the Oracle and its treasures, and have been so deeply permeated with its spirit, except by a prolonged and loving participation in the life of the Delphic town. Here is indeed a contrast with Athens which was growing out of the oracular and prophetic stage into that of the self-conscious reason. But our Historian took up both sides into his universal sym-

pathy, and gives both in his universal book on Hellas.

Far beyond the bounds of Greece the travels of Herodotus extended; in the present Book we have glimpses of his wanderings and investigations in Middle Asia, though it is not easy to point out the exact line and limit of his journeys. The great city Babylon he saw, pondered, and compared with the Greek world; it was indeed a soul-broadening contrast. The river Araxes in the far north he did not see, but has to take the report of others in reference to its size and character (202). He must have known the Persian language, and probably something of other Oriental tongues, which he needed in his travels and studies. Commentators generally suppose our Historian to have been ignorant of every language except his native Greek — a supposition wholly without foundation and against the reasonable probabilities of the case.

Accordingly, in the present Book we behold Herodotus, first of all, investigating and recording his home history, that of western Anatolia (Asia Minor), in which he places the rise of History; then we behold him traveling to Delphi, perchance consulting the Oracle about his contemplated History and about what he should do to make his record true and eternal, and getting the response to stay and absorb the Delphic spirit, which was then the central relig-

ious influence of all Hellas; still further, we behold him going to Athens and taking up Athenian spirit in its highest Periclean excellence; finally, we behold him traveling thousands of miles over vast Asiatic tracts to the great Oriental centers — Babylon, Nineveh, Susa (Persia), Ecbatana (Media).

Yet all this is not a mere rambling book of travels; it has a spiritual center round which the whole turns in due obedience; thus it becomes in the best sense a work of art.

BOOK SECOND.

In the preceding Book we saw the development of the Lydiad, or the movement of Lydia out of its mythical to its historical period through a line of kings ending in Croesus. Then it was absorbed into the greater Persiad, or the History of Persia, into whose movement all the nations of Central and Western Asia have been drawn by means of conquest. Such is the Herodotean conception of the historic process in the Orient. Now we are to see the same general principle applied to a new country, Egypt, which is to be shown in its geography, in its institutions, and in its lines of kings.

Cyrus, the great hero of the preceding Book, we beheld smitten with a tragic destiny at its conclusion. But the fate of the nation does not

depend on the fate of the individual hero ; history is more than a drama, it is many dramas ; the Persian national spirit, of which Cyrus was the highest expression, will continue to unfold its career after his death, till it also completes its cycle of development. Cambyses, son and successor of Cyrus, reaches out for Egypt ; consequently we are now to have an Egyptiad interwoven into this History.

The most important document pertaining to ancient Egypt is this Second Book of Herodotus. It is written in a spirit of genuine sympathy, and it imparts to the reader something of the wonder and veneration which the historian himself felt as he gazed upon that land of marvels. He is unconsciously seeking to bring the old and isolated nation into line with the World's History, and to raise to light the points of connection between it and the great new movement of the time. Egypt is conquered by Persia and so becomes a part of the Persian Empire in the latter's conflict with Hellas, which is the central event of the History of Herodotus, as well as of the age.

There is no doubt that Egypt's place is far up toward the head waters of civilization. It may not be the primordial fountain, still no other land, as far as is known at present, reaches beyond it in antiquity. The Nile of History has, indeed, its sources hidden, but it flows into

light first in Egypt, where it remains confined in a narrow channel for a long distance, till it pours into the great Midland Sea which washes the shores of so many European peoples.

Herodotus is a Greek, and he is particularly eager to find out the relations between his race and the Egyptians. He traveled in Egypt probably between the years 460-455 B. C., a period which reaches from his twenty-fourth to his twenty-ninth year. (See Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, Vol. I., p. 12.) This was the period of the revolt of Inarus, when an Athenian army had possession of Egypt. Still the Greeks had obtained a foothold in the land of Nile during the reign of Psammetichus, more than two hundred years before, and had begun to break down its exclusiveness. The same king caused a number of Egyptian children to be instructed in the Greek tongue, from whom was descended a special class, the interpreters. One of these accompanied Herodotus in his visit to the pyramids, as cicerone, and read the inscriptions. A hundred years before the time of our historian, Amasis was king of Egypt, who was also very friendly to the Greeks. Thus for more than two hundred years antecedent to the visit of Herodotus, the Greek language had a certain currency in Egypt, and with it had come Greek ideas, mythology, literature, Homer.

Our young traveler, therefore, saw an Egypt

which was well acquainted with his countrymen. Indeed Grecian intercourse with the people of the Nile goes back to Homer, who also, specially in the *Odyssey*, spins a thread of connection between Hellas and Egypt. On many sides the relation was friendly. The Greek was, in the time of Herodotus, the strong, beautiful youth of the world; the Egyptian was an old man, whose time had passed, but who wished, even while looking into the setting sun, to impart his wisdom to the coming time. We see in this Book that there was a double movement, from each side, toward a mutual acquaintance and adjustment. The Greeks in Egypt sought to peer into their own origin through Egyptian history; they translated specially the ancient Gods of the valley of the Nile into their own Pantheon, and connected themselves and their religion with the oldest of nations. On the other hand the priests of Egypt, depositories of its venerable lore, took the attitude of the aged seer toward the young man who was starting in life, the attitude of the Orient to the Occident, as if saying: We made you what you are, we gave you your wisdom and your deities; listen, therefore, with reverence. Hence it is that the Orient resents with such contempt the idea that the Occident should send missionaries to their part of the world to teach them in matters of religion; better reverse the

process. So the Orientals think and act to-day ; so those old Egyptian priests thought and acted toward Herodotus, the young Greek traveler, who listened not only with reverence, but with a certain degree of faith to their marvelous statements. Accordingly he will endeavor to link together Greece and Egypt; especially he will try to connect Greek and Egyptian religion and mythology.

We can also see that even the exclusive, secretive Egyptian is putting himself in line with Universal History, is ready for Herodotus to appear and to record the new situation. Such is the outcome of Greek influence for several centuries. The grand connection is brought about in this Second Book; Egypt with its Nile is made to pour through the Greek consciousness, which reveals it to the world, having been hitherto largely a land of mystery, of concealment, of darkness. To be sure the historian does not tell all he knows; so strong is his sympathy that an Egyptian awe steals over him at times and he refuses to reveal certain sacred secrets.

It is characteristic that the first thing of which Herodotus speaks in reference to Egypt is its claim to antiquity. "The Egyptians before the reign of Psammetichus believed themselves to be the most ancient of mankind" (c. 2). Mark that this Psammetichus is the king who broke down the barriers and let in the Greeks,

two centuries before Herodotus. The ruler is now an investigator of infantile science. The story of the two children reared in a lowly hut and suckled by goats, rests on the supposition that when these children begin to talk, they will utter the first human word, which is here declared to be *becos*. This, the author says, is the Phrygian word for bread; hence the Phrygians are the oldest people.

Two very different explanations of this word *becos* have been given. The professional philologist sees in it an Aryan root akin to the English *bake* or even to *pa*, father. Better would it be to regard the root as the child's imitation of the bleat of the goat or of the kid when hungry for its portion of milk. Romulus, suckled by a she-wolf, would probably give a different call for his nourishment.

Herodotus reports that the Egyptians gave up their claim of being the most ancient of men after this experiment; if so, they were easily satisfied. But Diodorus, writing of Egypt some four hundred years after Herodotus, says that the people of the Nile valley in his time still maintained that they were the oldest of mankind. This is probably the truth of the matter, though our historian implies that he received his information from three sets of priests, those at Memphis, at Heliopolis, and at Thebes. We to-day have to acknowledge that Egypt's claim to the

most ancient civilization among men has the greatest probability of truth.

Modern linguistic research has sought in various ways to connect the Egyptian tongue with the leading divisions of human speech, Aryan, Semitic, and Turanian, and thus to probe down to the question of origin. The results as yet are uncertain. A curious point is that the language of the hieroglyphics is said to show decided Celtic affinities, and the Irishman's statement that Irish was the man's primordial tongue, spoken first in the garden of Eden, may yet be confirmed. The general trend of opinion among investigators seems to be that the Egyptian language shows traces of the primitive tongue spoken before the separation of the Aryan and Semitic into two great families of speech, which would throw Egypt far back into a very remote time for its beginning, and connect it with Asia. The question, however, whether Egyptian civilization came from Asia, or Asiatic civilization came from Egypt, remains unanswered.

Far more profitable than this search for origin is the tracing of the Egyptian stream into those peoples who succeeded it in the World's History, specially the Greek and the Hebrew. The Greek connection in its earliest form is unfolded in this Second Book of Herodotus, which is now the subject of our study.

The Historian himself has hinted his division of the Book (c. 99) into two parts: his own personal account of "what he saw, thought and learned by inquiry," and the account of the Egyptians themselves. The former will, therefore, be of the Present, the latter of the Past, though both elements will intermingle in each case.

The first part of the Second Book easily subdivides into two portions. After a kind of Introduction (1-5), there will be an account of Physical Egypt with its River (6-34); then the author will pass to "a more extended account" (35) of the country because of its "wonders and its works;" such an account we may in general call Spiritual Egypt in contrast with the preceding, as it takes up the religion, customs, arts, institutions of the land. The relation between the two elements (physical and spiritual) is very close, probably closer in Egypt than in any other country that ever existed.

The portion devoted to the Past (beginning at c. 99) we shall call Historical Egypt, since it deals with kings and dynasties that have been, and recounts their deeds and works. So much for the structure of this Book, as it lay in the mind of Herodotus. We shall permit ourselves one slight change in it; instead of making two subdivisions of the first part, we shall at once

cast the whole Book into three main divisions as follows: —

- I. Physical Egypt.
- II. Spiritual Egypt.
- III. Historical Egypt.

This arrangement (for us, at least) simplifies the matter, and sets forth the thought and the movement of the Book in a clearer light.

I. PHYSICAL EGYPT.

This naturally starts with "the gift of the River," the Delta, for the Delta and the Nile are the two positive factors of physical Egypt, in the view of Herodotus (5-34).

The stream and its alluvion are hedged about by seas, by deserts and by barren mountains — an environment of desolation, through which the river pours a line of green fertility. Egypt proper is estimated to have an area of about 100,000 square miles, of which hardly more than one-tenth is cultivable. The country in its best days probably contained not more than seven millions of inhabitants, all clinging to the stream.

Every bit of Egypt, therefore, worthy of the name, is "the gift of the river," as the historian says. Especially is this the case with the Delta. About 100 miles from the sea the Nile forks and sends one branch to the right and one to the left, which reach the Mediterranean some 300

miles apart. Besides these two extreme mouths, five others are counted between them, two of which are artificial. Such is the Delta, filled anciently with flourishing cities.

We see that in antiquity (c. 15) the question had arisen, which still gives trouble: To which grand division of the globe does Egypt properly belong—to Asia or Africa? Geographically it is embraced in the latter, but spiritually it is absolutely distinct; it connects in history with Asia on one side and with Europe on the other. Not African surely, nor can we deem it Asiatic; Egypt is a peculiar world, “the gift of the river,” which is the next phenomenon considered by the historian.

The first great mystery connected with the Nile, in the eyes of Herodotus, is the fact that it rises in summer—from the end of June till September, when it is highest—then falls in the winter, which is the rainy season in Greece and in other countries known to our author. We see that the circumstance had evoked much speculation among the Greeks, who were seeking for a physical cause; three theories are examined and rejected. Then Herodotus gives his own view, obscure enough, yet seeming to be about this: the Sun is the cause; being driven from the north by the storms of winter, “he retires to Libya,” to the south, where he attracts or dries up the Nile. But “when winter grows mild,” he returns

to the north (Tropic of Cancer), and then "attracts water equally from all rivers;" thus the Nile is relieved from his special presence, and begins rising. Herein the Sun seems to be controlled by the seasons instead of causing them; he is conceived as the bright migrating bird of the skies flying southward with the approach of inclement weather, and returning to the north with the spring.

Closely allied with the preceding problem is another, that of the sources of the Nile. Our author confesses that they are unknown to him, and he clearly holds that they were unknown to the Egyptians. He himself went as far as Elephantine in order to investigate the subject; that city lies on the Nile 700 miles from the sea; there he found the African wall which shuts in Egypt, and beyond it he could not penetrate. Vague rumors he picks up and tells (c. 28-34); but that whole borderland begins to lapse into fable. Still here is the grand fact: the mighty river bearing all its fertility comes flowing hither out of an unknown world, and lays down at the feet of men its gift, which is just this Egyptian land.

As is well known, it is our own age which has solved the problem of the sources of the Nile, which fact is indeed a typical one of the century. The river rises in Equatorial Africa from two great lakes called Albert and Victoria Nyanza,

which are fed mainly by heavy rains for nine months of the year. The Nile on its journey to the sea starts from Albert Nyanza about 2,000 miles from its mouth direct, or 2,500 miles, if its windings be included. This is the true Nile or the so-called White Nile, which is a permanent, almost unvarying stream, pushing its vast volume of water through an arid desert to the Mediterranean. The rise of the Nile is caused by its affluents, chief of which is the Bahr-el-Azrak or Blue Nile in Abyssinia, and the last of which is the Atbara, which empties into it 1100 miles from its mouth (Sir Samuel Baker). The tributaries of the Nile bring the fertilizing soil, which is carried by the body of the river into Egypt and there deposited. Such are the two chief elements of the Nile system.

We have now before us the main physical fact pertaining to the Nile and the Delta. In shape the whole was compared by the old navigator Scylax to a double-edged battle-ax with its long handle reaching up to Elephantine. But it is far more significant to compare Egypt to a human hand at the end of the outstretched arm, with the five fingers extended, corresponding to the five natural mouths in the Delta. That hand is not smiting with a battle-ax but is bountifully giving, or perchance is spread out for sowing the crop. Moreover the forearm is visible for quite a distance, but the upper part passes into the invis-

ible; the shoulder, the body, the face of that mighty form reaching out of the Beyond are unseen, invisible as spirit itself. Verily it is the hand of deity, of Father Nile, giving his blessing to his favored children of Egypt. The form, the situation, the action of the river, all force the conception of God, the Giver, Provider, beneficent, yet covered with darkness, whose hand alone with a little of the arm is visible. No wonder that the old historian regards the Egyptians as the most religious of mortals, being driven, first of all men, to make the grand distinction between the Seen and the Unseen, the Sensible and the Supersensible, and gradually between the Finite and the Infinite. So already ancient Homer shadows forth this distinction in his myth of Proteus.

Hence Egypt is the real Holy Land, which conception passed thence to the Hebrews and Arabians. Religion becomes its all-environing element; man is fed directly by the Gods; even the animals, products of the Nile, become sacred. Also a sacred writing rises into existence, the hieroglyphic; the idea of the Holy Book or Bible springs from Egypt and the Nile, and passes to other peoples of the Orient, and also to the Occident, which has not produced and cannot produce a Holy Book of its own. Thus the Nile stream is still flowing through us all.

Let us note again the fact that to the Egyptian

the source of the River was hidden; the body, the face, even a part of the arm were in the region of the Unseen. Egypt, therefore, becomes a land of mystery, of dark symbolic ceremonies, of the mystical consciousness in general, it is the primitive source of the mystery as an element of religion.

The Egyptians lived not only through the activity of this hand, but lived in it literally; it gave them not only their sustenance, but their terrestrial standing-room. Hence there are two great gifts of the Nile, the eternal and the temporal ones, the soil itself and the renewed annual deposit, the gift of the ages and the gift of the year. The same double character will manifest itself in Egyptian life; even the Gods will show an eternal and a phenomenal element.

Thus man in Egypt was one with the Nile, he clung to its banks, he could not be separated from it without death. He became exclusive, peculiar, self-introverted, secretive. How different the Greek! Open, self-reliant, enterprising, he can bring freedom and the secular world into existence. Herodotus contrasts the Ister (Danube), which is for him the great European river, with the Nile; the Ister has no secrets, no mystery, being known from its fountain head to its mouth, lying all the way in the sunlight, a type of Europe.

The hand is not only an implement of the body,

but is one of the most significant symbols of the spirit. The great hand of the Nile feeds the Egyptian infant, truly the infant of the World's History, who is yet to become a man. These primitive children are scattered helpless up and down the valley of the River; they are put into a marvelous garden, tilled by the unseen hand; a child garden (kindergarden) it may be called, first of its kind, and to a certain extent the pattern of all succeeding ones, in which the primeval man-child learns his earliest and most important lesson from his invisible teacher, namely that he lives in and through a Divine Order.

The Egyptian, therefore, is led through Nature into that which is beyond; the known, the finite is here before him, but it springs directly out of an unknown, an infinite. Hence he passes by means of the Nile out of the physical into the spiritual world, the river itself dividing into two parts, the seen and the unseen. For Herodotus this division takes place at the border city of Elephantine, which he says that he visited.

We may note again the fact of the exclusiveness of physical Egypt as indicated by nature. (1) The total country is inclosed on every side by sea and desert, with a narrow gateway connecting with Asia. (2) The River, inside of Egypt, is inclosed in its narrow channel and its delta. Thus a double separation from the outer world is

given by nature, or a double rampart against external powers. (3) Another separation is that of the stream of the Nile within itself into its pure and permanent body, and its turbid, unclean addition of sediment and water; rise and fall of the Nile, growth and decline. (4) Then another separation of the River into the known and the unknown portions. (5) Still further, the Nile divides this inner Egypt, its own land, into two well-marked parts — Upper and Lower Egypt, or the Delta and the River Valley. Thus nature dualizes Egypt on many sides, and each one of these dualisms leaves its imprint on her spirit, individualizes her character among the peoples of the world.

The River overflows not alone for irrigation, but also for a deposit of sediment; it brings not simply moisture, but the very soil along with itself. It makes a new earth, the land is reborn every year, like the season, like Osiris, like the Sun to a degree. Thus is the cycle of life suggested by nature, and enters deeply into Egyptian spirit. Moreover, the gift is certain, it never fails, though sometimes more and sometimes less. The Nile does not forget. No plow is needed, it is the plower, too, though man has to sow. Only a few times comparatively has the Nile stinted his gift to the extent of producing a famine.

In Greece, on the contrary, is the rain-god

Zeus, sending his showers for humidity only, not sending the soil, which has to be plowed and tilled with great care and economy, being in little patches here and there amid the rocks. Small alluvial valleys are indeed found in Greece, but no great Nile Hand reaching out from the Unseen God and giving food to His children.

II. SPIRITUAL EGYPT.

That which the Egyptian sees to be true of the river, with its two halves, visible and invisible, he will make the pattern or transforming idea of the whole sense-world. Upon it he will found his customs, his institutions, his religion, art, literature.

This twofoldness, the sensible and supersensible, will be noted everywhere. The secular life will be distinct from the religious, and overarched by the latter. There will be a class, the priests, who will deal with the unseen, the mysteries, the Gods, hence Egypt is the very home of priestcraft. Not to be considered a cunning set of men keeping the people in ignorance and superstition; they had to arise in the Nile valley, and the people would have none other; these would have driven out any different system, as something foreign to their spirit. There will be the veiled image of the Goddess at Sais, and the Sphinx with her riddle. The

priests will know the inner meaning of rites and worship, the multitude will cling to the sensuous side for dear life ; the latter is the seen Nile, the other the unseen. Outer idols, yet inner spirit also ; the spirit will have its caste.

On these lines two great influences are to move forth from Egypt. Judea will take the supersensible element, this pure spirit, and break the idol, and flee to its own land through the wilderness. The sensuous Nile is dropped, rooted out, destroyed ; Jehovah is the one God, eternal as spirit, and so lives to-day and keeps his people alive. Such is the Egyptian contribution to man, being purified by passing through the Semitic soul.

On the other hand, Greece developed the sense side, the finite Nile, kept the idols, but transfigured them into works of art. Polytheism the Greek retains ; Egypt is both, monotheistic in esoteric doctrine, polytheistic in exoteric or popular doctrine.

A Hebrew document and a Greek document give the history of these transitions — the Pentateuch and this Second Book of Herodotus.

We observe the same dualism in writing — sacred (hieroglyphic) and profane (demotic), one for the priests, the other for the people. Even in speech too ; some things to be spoken, others to remain unspoken, nay unspeakable.

Deeply significant is it to note how this Eryp-

tian characteristic has entered the very soul of our historian. He will not tell the secrets, which are not to be spoken, for speech has two sides, the voiced for the sense of hearing, and the unvoiced for the spirit. Hence he feels the Egyptian mystery and preserves silence; he, the talkative Greek, receives the impress of the Nile also, else indeed he were no good reporter. Still, even by his silence, he reveals a phase of Egyptian spirit, probably better than by any description.

We can trace from the relation of the Egyptian to the Nile some of the most important subjective traits of his religion. He receives blessings for which he can give no return — gratitude; he knows not whence these blessings come — wonder; he must rely upon them regularly — trust; he must conciliate the unseen power, that it continue to be friendly — worship with its rites, formulas, organization. Dependence was their trait, with all its allied advantages and drawbacks; Egyptians were children with a sweet submission on the one hand; or they might be called Nature's beggars, who lived off her alms without much effort on their own part, and were very importunate in their solicitations, spending their lives in prayers and ceremonies and attitudes, all invoking their benefactor to give and to give again and to give more. An excess of religion is this for most minds of the

Occident, in which self-reliance rather is the law of conduct.

Only in one place in Egypt were there gymnastic contests, once a year. These were dedicated to a Greek hero, Perseus, in the city of Chemmis. Did he pass here on his way to Ethiopia to relieve Andromeda, the beautiful maiden, from the Oriental monster? The fact suggests one striking contrast between Hellas and Egypt. The Greek believed in a culture of the body during life, it too was to be unfolded, to be made perfect. But when life left it, it was burnt. The Egyptian, however, sought to preserve the body after death by embalming; it was not to be destroyed by fire, slow or speedy; he transformed it into a mummy; even the bodies of animals were embalmed and made to endure. Thus the Egyptians were more intent upon death and the hereafter, the Greeks the reverse. Hence the one reproduced the body in the beautiful statue, the other preserved it in the mummy, not beautiful.

In tracing the rise of mythology, which is a rise from nature to spirit, there are certain physical facts common to all mythologies. There are light and darkness, springing from one source, the sun, which gives the first dualism of nature, or separation into opposites. Then there are heat and cold, the second dualism of nature, also caused by the sun and producing

the seasons. So we have the daily and the yearly dualism of nature, as the original starting-point of the mythical consciousness of man. Universal it is among peoples on the globe and relates to man universally.

Then every people or time has some special form of nature which makes its mythology individual. The Egyptian had the phenomenon of the Nile, its rise and fall, its fertilizing gift, its passage from known to unknown. This will specialize its mythology, which rises from nature. The God Osiris dies and is born again; is entombed, embalmed, yet will return immortal. The Egyptian mythus will be unlike the Greek, which showed the sensuous subordination of the sensuous; the Greek mythus put down the Orient, which never put itself down.

So strong was the influence of the physical phenomenon of the Nile upon the Egyptian mind that the Sun, the main element in other mythologies, especially the Aryan, is absorbed by the Nile. The yearly Sun, with cold and heat elsewhere, is supplanted by the rise and fall of the Nile. Light and Darkness, or day and night, come, with their good and evil; but these have a much stronger suggestion in the Giver of fertility, the Nile, than in the Giver of Light. Still the Egyptians had their Sun-god (Ra) and their Sun-city (Heliopolis). Then there was no rainfall, no clouds obscuring the Sun, which

plays such a prominent part in the old Aryan mythology as seen in the Vedas. Aryans were plowers, but there was very little need of plowing in Egypt; crops were a gift. Greek clouds and rainfall (like the Aryan) play into Greek mythology.

Hence the Nile is the determining source of Egyptian mythology and religion (worship and rites). Yearly the Sun moves north and south with the fall and rise of the Nile. East and west are opposite to the Nile — hence light and darkness contribute not so much to Egyptian mythology.

That which individualizes Egypt and makes the Egyptian man distinctive is the Nile. What will be its effect upon the mind observing it, living with it? Let us trace the movement of the River, reflecting itself in the human soul. First it brings to consciousness the unknown and the known; then it vanishes and returns. Let us see the process. (1) The Nile as unknown — yet the Giver, Provider, the good. (2) The Nile as known, the gift, the sensuous fact, the finite world. (3) The Nile droops, falls, is old age; it vanishes into the sea, it dies like Osiris, and is absorbed, losing its individuality as River. Hence the lament of the people. (4) The Nile returns, is full the next season or cycle, returns out of the sea somehow, through the heavens. It has to go back to its unseen source and be individualized over again.

Such is the grand cycle of the Nile to which the Egyptian consciousness adjusts itself and in which it finds expression. We cannot say that the Nile creates the mind of Egypt, but it is the mould into which this mind pours itself and gets utterance, especially its mythical utterance, and also its religious, in rites and worship. Now a mountain utterance, like the Aryan, would be different. Yet the Ego is present in both cases, nature is its vehicle, which it transforms into a symbol.

Thus, of the cycle of the Nile, there is a small segment which is known, and a vast segment which is unknown. So nature calls forth the corresponding consciousness, it leaves its imprint upon the Ego. The Egyptian will pour his life into this fact of the Nile; life is a little fragment here and now, rolling out of the land to the sea; yet it will return after a long absence. Hence the Egyptian has the doctrine of immortality in one of its early forms. The Nile produces animals as it does man — its life goes over into the animal, which is a transformation like that of the river. Herein we may behold the hint of the doctrine of metempsychosis. Still the shriveled body of the Nile remains; in like fashion man must preserve the body dead as mummy, as the future bearer of life, quite as the Nile brings down life in its body by the addition of sediment and more water. The spirit of the Nile calls forth the mummy, tomb, labyrinth.

It is now known that the Nile divides itself into the pure body of water coming from the lakes, and the sedimentary waters of its affluents. The old Egyptian felt this, indeed saw it, in the two Niles of summer and winter, which are really the White Nile and the Blue Nile along with some other tributaries. Hence the dualism is in the water of the stream, with its permanent life-portion and the mere passing body.

Still the Egyptian, being mind, had to transcend even the Nile. It brought before him strongly the seen and the unseen, it split his consciousness into the known and unknown. But he has to reach over this unknown, grasp it, account for it. In other words, the whole Egyptian spirit shows a striving to know the unknown, to image it in the Gods, in the Mythos, in the religious ceremonial. The very fact of his saying "the unknown" is a kind of knowledge; when mind knows its limit, it has begun to transcend the same. So the spirit and its process take the form of the unknown in Egypt.

The Nile stream flows through all history, it is flowing through you and me now. It is of course transformed; it flowed through Judea and it flowed through Greece, bringing forth a new set of products each time. Now it is flowing into the Mississippi, which runs south, as the Nile runs north; one with a broad fertile valley, the other with a narrow valley, limiting and lim-

ited; the one with freedom, the other with restraint; the one determined the civilization of its dwellers, the other had its civilization brought to it

It will thus be seen that one great work of Egyptian mind was to transform the Nile into a vast symbol, in fact, all its manifestations became symbolic. Nature was made over into the bearer of mind; the physical object thus had two meanings, its own and a new one given to it by mind. The Nile Hand became the Giver, Creator reaching out of the Unseen; the Egyptian God Ptah, whose temple was built by Menes, the first king of Egypt, means *Hand* literally; so we can see how the conception of this deity arose. Truly it may be said that there is no understanding Egyptian spirit without understanding the symbolic, and its place in the history of culture as well as in the development of the individual mind. Egypt is the land of the symbol, with its fundamental division of itself into the sensible and the supersensible manifested also in the division of the Nile.

There is presupposed in the Nile Valley the Ego; whence it came and how it arose is not our inquiry. The Egyptian as such did not descend Nile from Meroe and bring his civilization, just as little did he come from Asia with his civilization. He was made an Egyptian in Egypt.

Nature always puts its stamp upon the people; it gives their particular character, it specializes them. Nature puts its limits upon the Ego and makes it an Egyptian Ego. Yet the other side is present: Nature does not create that primordial Ego, as far as we at present can ascertain.

But the Ego in the limits of Nature must show its unlimited, infinite character; it is something more than this special form, it is universal. It must find itself by always transcending itself. The Nile divides the Ego into known and unknown, yet the problem of the Ego is just to master this unknown and to transcend the bounds of the known. The limit put upon it by Nature, here by the Nile, gives it an Egyptian character; yet the Egyptian must in an Egyptian way show the limit-transcending trait of his own spirit. Hence all his efforts to reach beyond this unknown will be Egyptian in form. He must be seen as an Egyptian in Egyptian limits trying in Egyptian fashion to transcend his Egyptian limits and becoming universal, human.

Let us designate this Egyptian way. The Nile is the physical object which reveals man's consciousness to himself — hence the supreme symbol. The Nile is man, his life and death, its cycle is identified with the human cycle. To be sure, it is something different, namely a natural object; but through its cycle and through his

observing it completely the Egyptian finds it in himself and so becomes aware not only of it but also of himself. Thus through the Nile he begins to be self-conscious.

Still further, this Nile, being regarded as a man, is yet something far more than an individual man, greater, mightier; nay, it is himself as universal, it is God. For he is the finite man, corresponding to this finite Nile, product of the same; yet the river is the unknown or infinite Nile too, which is Osiris, the colossal man of the world, who also is born, dies and returns. This is the second division of the Nile; note again the suggestion in the physical fact that the Blue Nile is transitory, and the White Nile permanent.

The Egyptian first identifies the Nile with himself and so becomes self-conscious; secondly, this Nile-man he projects out of himself, and gets conscious of God. So the self-consciousness and the God-consciousness both arise to the Egyptian through the Nile.

Zeus, the rain-God, sends the showers upon the earth from the sky, hence, is a sky-God, light, clear, when the clouds are gone. But the Nile is a hidden God, unknown, yet terrestrial. Light plays a secondary part in Egyptian Religion and Mythology, as compared with the Persian, Greek, or Vedic.

III. HISTORICAL EGYPT.

With chapter 99 begins a new section of this Second Book, which tells of some of the kings of Egypt, as well as their works and actions. Our author marks the transition with decided emphasis: "Hitherto I have given what I personally saw, thought, and learned by inquiry; henceforth I shall give the account of the Egyptians, adding certain things which came under my own eyes." Moreover, we also learn that the priests were his informants, those who were the depositories of Egypt's ancient lore, and who largely lived in her antiquity. This fact indicates an important spiritual trait of theirs, which will play a part in the forthcoming history.

How shall the reader, seeking to grasp the essence of the matter, regard this line of Egyptian kings? Herodotus does not pretend to give the names of them all; it is clear that he makes a selection. But what is his principle of selection? Unless they made "a showing of works"

by erecting some great monument, or performed "something brilliant" in the way of exploits (101), the historian drops their names, casting them all at one throw into the sea of oblivion.

This list of Herodotus is, therefore, not so much a list of kings as a list of great deeds; a king who does nothing worthy of kingship is no better than a common man. The mighty fact which the historian saw in Egypt was the stupendous works of aforetime; how did they get to be? A chaos of names, numbers, facts, fancies, were tumbled out before him; he starts to arranging them as best he can, according to his fundamental conception of historic order.

This conception, as we have already seen, is twofold: cyclical and progressive. Herodotus had deeply implanted in his spirit the idea of a cycle both in human affairs and in human conduct. It lay in the Greek consciousness from the beginning; Homer has it, and the poets of the Trojan War, are, as a whole, termed cyclical; the Attic tragedians apply it to man's deed, and Herodotus applies it to History in his thought of Nemesis.

The Egyptians also had the cycle as physical in the yearly return of the Nile, and in the return of the soul to its former habitation. But the Greeks conceived the cycle as spiritual, and separated it from its physical substrate, wherein lies their advance upon the Egyptians.

Now Herodotus will apply the idea of the cycle to the list of kings, so that each name will stand for something in the movement of Egyptian civilization; if not for something important always, at least for a good story, since that barren inventory of royal names is death to the sprightly Greek, though it may be dear to an Egyptian priest. Then another principle comes into play: the idea of progress, which also lies deep in the spirit of our historian. The cycle does not move merely back to its beginning and so keep on repeating itself in an everlasting routine, but it also moves forward, it has development, progress; it begins the new age laden with all the treasures of the old, and advances toward its goal by always coming back to itself.

Such are the two elements deeply underlying the historic conception of Herodotus, which he will apply, indeed cannot help applying, more or less unconsciously, to Egyptian history. We shall follow him on these lines, and seek to make them more prominent and distinct, which is possible chiefly through the fact that we can look back at him through more than twenty-three centuries, and see the complete unfolding of that which he only saw in the germ.

I. THE FIRST CYCLE. This presents to us the movement of old Egypt, after the rule of the Gods, which rule Herodotus expressly leaves

out. The land of the Nile organizes itself internally first then it bursts its bounds and rushes forth to conquest, which embraces quite the whole Orient; thereby it comes in contact with the Occident, the new world, represented by the Greeks. The three stages of this cycle may be designated by the three leading kings, though others are mentioned.

1. *Menes*. Such is the name of the first king of Egypt, imparted to Herodotus by the priests, and confirmed generally by succeeding authors and by the monuments. This name has surprising analogies among many peoples of the globe, being given to some early king, law-giver or God — the Lydian Manes, the Greek Minos, the Hindoo Menu, the Teutonic Mannus, to which list we may add the English word *man*. The Egyptian Menes does indeed the first work of man in the Nile valley in furthering a civilized order.

The prime fact of his career is that he built the capital Memphis in the right spot to unite the two parts of Egypt, upper and lower, which nature has made so different, and which have a tendency to separate. The one a long strip, the other a triangular field, the one scattered, the other concentrated, they will certainly be always in danger of going asunder. Memphis, built at the apex of the Delta, is by its position the unifier. So we catch the idea of Menes in his first

work, which makes Egypt one nation, uniting the hand to the arm of the Nile Valley.

Moreover he turned the Nile by an embankment, and made it flow around the new city, excavating also a lake which was situated to the north and the west of Memphis. Thus the capital was surrounded by water, and lay on an artificial island. All this must have been the work of a great engineer and builder; he handles already the mighty River, bending it to his purpose; he erects a city in its former channel, and encircles the same with water, for protection against the enemy. Menes already shows the architectonic spirit of Egypt.

Herodotus states also that this king built the vast temple of Vulcan, who was the Egyptian God Ptah, the divine architect, maker of the universe. Him the Greeks call the artificer, or demiurge, the true deity of the Egyptian mind, which chiefly uttered itself in building; true patron deity also of Menes whom we have already seen as builder. Doubtless from the priests of this temple our historian derived the information, which he has here given to us. How old Egypt then was, let us ponder: between the reader reading these words at the end of the 19th century and Herodotus listening to the priests in the temple of Ptah, lie some twenty-three centuries and a half; but between Herodotus and Menes lies a greater length of

time, according to the reckoning of most Egyptologists.

Now follows a curious passage of our historian: "After this king the priests read me from a book the names of 330 other kings," whose reigns had occupied as many generations; 330 generations would fill 11,000 years. It is manifest that Herodotus was puzzled much by these figures. Moreover the list was a very barren one, only two of the names are deemed worthy of mention. One is that of a woman who is evidently noted down because she was a woman and not a man, our historian being quite partial to queens throughout his history. The other name is that of Moeris, also an engineer and builder, and thus a repetition of Menes, inasmuch as he too dug a lake and built a portal to the temple of Ptah, as well as some pyramids. The reigns of these two monarchs, Menes and Moeris, lay many hundreds of years apart; indeed, if we accept the chronology of Dr. Brugsch, and place the reign of Menes at 4455 B. C., the two kings will be separated by more than 3000 years. But Egyptian chronology is a very uncertain thing; no wonder the Father of History held aloof from it as soon as he heard it from those priests. Still here are the monuments, here are the antiquities, which must be accounted for; accordingly they are arranged in groups which show the movement of Egyptian history, and are labeled with the name of typical kings.

Menes, therefore, may well stand for the inner development of Egypt, and its unification into one people. His is the spirit of construction; he built cities and great public works, he also built the nation. He lasted much longer than his life, we have to think; he represents an epoch or an element which enters into Egyptian civilization. The works of many kings and many ages may be stamped with his label; as, indeed, the mythical spirit has a tendency to cluster all the great works and deeds of an era around some one great name.

2. *Sesostris*. Egypt having been unified within and having reached a high stage of inner development, begins to move outward and to assert herself in the rest of the world. She subjects other peoples, she goes forth beyond her own bounds which have become too small for her spirit, and marks out for herself new limits on the globe. She cannot remain cooped up in the valley of the Nile, she breaks her Egyptian shell and marches mightily forth to conquest.

This movement from internal development to external conquest is connected with the name of Sesostris. Though the Egyptians were hardly a seafaring people, this king gathered ships of war on the Red Sea, and sought to conquer by means of a navy—a plan which probably did not succeed. Then he collected a vast army and

traversed the continent, reaching even Thrace and Scythia on the North and extending his sway to the Ethiopians on the South. Concerning his conquests eastward no statement is given by our historian. It is manifest, however, that Sesostris is conceived as pushing out the arms of Egypt quite to the limits of the then known world; he ran up to the rim of the desert and of savagery which surrounded the more civilized portion of mankind. This rim we shall see to be a very important element in the historic conception of Herodotus.

Such was the culmination of the national spirit of Egypt, the period of its greatest power and glory. It is now generally acknowledged that the military exploits of several of the most warlike Egyptian monarchs are ascribed to Sesostris. The original Sesostris is supposed to be King Osirtasen I. of the Twelfth Dynasty (B. C. 2080, according to Mr. Stuart Poole, but B. C. 3064 according to M. Lenormant). The fact is that Sesostris was the typical Egyptian conqueror, standing for all of them, and representing the spirit of conquest. As already stated in the case of Menes, the people concentrate all the great deeds and characters of an epoch or of a class into one personality. The people are mythical in spirit and must have the all-embracing hero. Our historian sympathizes

with this popular trait, he can do nothing with a long chronological list of kings.

Such, then, is the main fact of Sesostris — external conquest. But other points are noted. Very naturally his absence from home caused internal trouble; his brother conspired against him — which resulted in a terrible domestic tragedy. The prisoners whom he brought from foreign lands he compelled to dig canals; with the name of Sesostris is connected the canalization of Egypt. His name is also connected with the land tenure of the Nile valley; “he made a division of the soil among all Egyptians, giving a square plot of ground to each one” (109); that is, the individual ownership of property is ascribed to him. Also he was a builder and a patron of sculpture.

The Egyptian, however, was no organizer of conquest, such as was the Persian, notably Darius. Booty and captives were brought back from conquered lands, but there never was probably a vast consolidated Egyptian Empire. The greatest of Egyptian conquerors is now known by the name of Thothmes III. (eighteenth dynasty, 1700–1600 B. C.), who seems to have overrun all Western Asia. But he, too, had quite vanished into the name of Sesostris when Herodotus visited Egypt twelve centuries after his time. The one represented all; in the royal list of Herodotus there is no other conqueror.

Sesostris is succeeded by a son who evidently was not like his father. A story is told of him and then he is dismissed. The military epoch is past; just through her wars, Egypt is brought in contact with other nations. Sesostris is the name which represents Egypt as breaking over her ancient limits, becoming universal, uniting with Asiatic nations, and sharing in the movement of the World's History. Next comes her relation to Europe, the new continent of that time, with its new spirit represented by Greece. Now to the Greek mind the grand conflict between Orient and Occident was begun on the plains of Troy, and was sung of by Homer. Accordingly our historian introduces an Egyptian king who lived in the time of the Trojan War, and who is to show his attitude toward that conflict, as well as towards Homer and Helen.

3. *Proteus*. The name is Greek and is undoubtedly derived from the *Odyssey*, which represents the sea-god Proteus as frequenting the island of Pharos along the coast of Egypt. The mythus again takes him up, but places him now upon the Egyptian throne, from which he is to utter his decision in the famous case of Helen and Paris.

The land of the Nile was known to Homer. The *Iliad*, in an oft-cited passage, speaks of the hundred gates of Egyptian Thebes, and the *Odyssey* draws Egypt into the stream of its action,

inasmuch as Menelaus and Helen are borne to Egypt on their return home from Troy. In fact, the old Greek poet mythologizes Egyptian spirit into the form of the sea-god Proteus, who hints the manifold appearance of the sense-world, yet also the essence therein; those transformations of Proteus in the *Odyssey* are the outward shows of things, while there is underneath them all one abiding substance, which is the true form of the god, and which Menelaus is at last to grasp and make talk. (See author's *Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*, Book IV.) So we have seen the Nile breaking forth into many shapes of nature — animal, plant, man — yet there is the one principle under all its manifestations.

Now Menelaus, as a Greek, has to solve the Egyptian problem before he can get home to Greece with his Helen. He must in his way master the dualism between sense and spirit, between known and unknown. His way is the mythical, Homer is a natural mythologist, all the movements of his own spirit and of the World's History belonging to his time he transforms into a Mythus. Thus he has done with Egypt in the story of Proteus. Also in the second part of the *Odyssey* (the last twelve Books) Egypt appears in the background repeatedly. Here, then, we see the first traces of intercourse between Greece and Egypt, long before the time of

Psammetichus and Amasis, who took Greeks into their service.

Herodotus says that Homer lived 400 years "before my time," and there is no doubt that the Ionians and Carians from the coast of Asia Minor near Troy, and from the islands of the Egean, had brought to Egypt the knowledge of Homer, and of the Trojan struggle. The Egyptian priests, therefore, had known of the great Greek epics for 200 years before Herodotus, and had transformed them according to the Egyptian idea, which transformation we are now to hear.

In the first place, these priests report that Paris and Helen were driven by contrary winds to Egypt, where the king, Proteus, learning of the wrong, detained Helen. Then the Greeks make the expedition to Troy, capture the city, but find no Helen. Menelaus goes to Egypt, where he recovers his wife and treasures, and, requiting evil for good, does a great wrong to the Egyptians, for which he is driven away.

Such is the Tale of Troy Egyptianized. The sack of the Trojan city is for nothing, the great conflict between Orient and Occident has no meaning. Helen is really in Egypt, not in Troy; Proteus is the moral hero, and surrenders her to her rightful lord without a fight; he does not care for the ideal Greek beauty, nor does Egypt. Finally the wicked deed is done by the Greek

chieftain, who is for his conduct driven out of Egypt.

Such is, then, the Egyptian Iliad. The priests take Helen away from Paris, and keep her and restore her, according to justice, abolishing the Trojan War, or the great Greek movement, which gives the supreme picture of Hellenic spirit in the heroic age, and indeed for all time. Still we should note that Egypt recognizes Greece in restoring Helen.

The historian in the main agrees with the Egyptian view. Already we have seen him in a kind of moral protest against the Trojan legend. The same protest was common at Athens in his time, and was specially voiced by Euripides. Our author indeed becomes quite dramatic in this part, and employs speeches and dialogue; he catches some of the Homeric vividness in speaking of Homer.

Naturally the question comes up: Who made the story? It is manifestly a product of Greek and Egyptian combined; the myth-making spirit could not help working over the old legend and adjusting it to the new circumstances. Homer was probably an Ionic Greek and sang his strains on the coast of Asia Minor and among the isles of the Aegean. From the same quarter came later those Ionic mercenaries who were given a foothold in Egypt by King Psammetichus and King Amasis. We can still im-

agine those Ionic soldiers chanting the measures of their great poet in their camp alongside the Nile, and gradually bringing him and his theme to the knowledge of the priests. The interpreters, sprung of both nationalities, must also have united the characteristics of both, and have helped to bring about a spiritual acquaintance between the two peoples. Hence arose a Greco-Egyptian Mythus, a thread of which we find running through this Second Book of Herodotus and culminating in the legend of Proteus.

Thus the Homeric poems, the earliest and greatest Greek book, are interwoven into Egyptian history. It is true that there never was such an Egyptian King as Proteus, his name has not been found on the monuments; still Greek influence, even Homer, is entering Egypt, just as Egyptian influence is entering Greece, as celebrated in many a legend. Greece is the next heir of Egypt in the World's History; we shall henceforth see the Egyptian world slowly vanishing into the Grecian, till the Ptolemies, Greek conquerors and kings possess and rule the valley of the Nile.

So we may affirm that Herodotus, in this Mythus of Proteus, is truer to the spirit of history than the monuments, which are mute on this subject of Greek influence, for the priests probably would not acknowledge it. Yet the Greco-Egyptian bridge on which the World-Spirit

travels out of Egypt and the Orient into Hellas and the Occident, is being rapidly constructed.

But the Homeric mythical connection is not the only one in Greek story. There is the tale of Oedipus who guesses the sphinx-riddle, being thus the Greek intelligence which solves the Egyptian problem. There is the Minotaur, half man and half bull, an Egyptian shape of a God, guarding the Cretan Labyrinth, also derived from Egypt; this Minotaur is slain by a Greek hero, Theseus, and the Labyrinth is threaded. So Perseus another Greek hero frees the beautiful Andromeda from an Oriental monster; Bellerophon also puts down the Chimaera, the commingled animal shape of the East. And Zeus, disguised in the form of a bull, and appearing to fair Europa, expresses a Greco-Egyptian mythical relation.

Thus our historian, seeking to set forth not merely certain deeds done, but to give the history of a total consciousness, cannot leave out the mythical element, if he is faithful to his call. For the earliest form in which history expresses itself is the mythus. Especially the imaginative Greek spirit, receiving from and giving to the Orient, uttered itself wholly in a mythical form at first, and partially so to the last.

Such is an outline of the first cycle of Egyptian History as conceived by Herodotus, not

altogether consciously and clearly, but with a Greek poetic instinct which compels him to set in some kind of order the chaotic mass of names and events before him. In Menes is the idea of an internal unfolding into a nation, the rise of that individual people called Egyptian. In Sesostris we see the same people expanding beyond their national limits and taking up into themselves other nations by conquest, especially Asiatic, Oriental. In Proteus we observe that they are brushing against Europe, they have met the Greeks, their future masters, who are their successors in the grand world-historical movement from Orient to Occident. As yet, however, this Greek element is but a secret influence entering the Egyptian soul, not recognized by the Egyptian, but distinctly seen and indicated by the Greek historian looking backward in time.

Rhampsinitus. As a kind of pendant to the Egyptian transformation of Homer, we next are treated to a wholly different sort of tale, which is usually called the Treasure of Rhampsinitus. It belongs to the same species as the well-known Master Thief, and has its counterpart in folk-tales of all peoples, which have often in them a strain of glorification for the man of cunning. The Odyssey is not altogether exempt from such a tendency. Still the present tale is on the whole in strong contrast with the Homeric tale

of Helen, in which the stolen is restored, and the arch-thief along with his people receive punishment. At present, however, the robber is the hero, and is successful in all that he undertakes. It has a decided touch of the Arabian Nights, and as the Arabians were neighbors to Egypt and always in close communication with it, we may here find an early edition of an Arabian tale transferred to Egyptian soil. Certainly it is, as here told, more Oriental than Greek, though Herodotus may have derived it from his Greek guide.

The general trend of the story is that authority is foiled at every point by cunning, and has to compromise with the latter, else it will steal all the State's treasures. Thus the tale hints a perennial condition of things; old Egypt had the same difficulty as modern Chicago. How can the social order get the man of intellectual keenness on its side? Observe that the king gives to the arch-thief his own daughter, and thus secures himself. The skillful thief (boodler we sometimes call him now) knows the secret stone of the treasure house, and pulls it out; then he enters and helps himself. Somehow the king, (our Law), cannot catch him; nay, he often makes his own terms with the Law-giving power (Legislature). So we can well have our modernized edition of this old folk-tale of the Treasure of Rhampsinitus, inasmuch the material

of it is eternal, and may take on various forms according to nation, custom, and environment.

II. THE SECOND CYCLE. The previous cycle showed Egypt in its greatness; it developed to its fullness, it broke forth from its bounds and imposed its influence upon foreigners, but foreign influence has begun to return upon it and to determine its character. Herewith takes place an inner scission; the two tendencies, domestic and foreign, meet upon Egyptian soil; there result civil strife, war, inner disruption. Egypt is passing out of its exclusive, isolated, individual condition, and is being slowly absorbed into the greater movement of the World's History; but it has first to be all broken to pieces, its refractory spirit of isolation, its pride must be crushed for a thousand years.

Many are the phases of this inner trouble, but the chief conflict lay between king and priesthood, the secular and the religious elements, or, as we say, between State and Church. Medieval Europe went through a corresponding transition in the strife between the royal and the papal power. The priesthood sought to keep the country apart, exclusive, for itself, to hold it forever under the might of sacerdotalism. But there was a national movement in the land, or perchance a world-historical trend, which was bent upon breaking those inner bonds of the priesthood.

It is true that the history of Herodotus does not in so many words make the above statements, but it gives the facts and the reigns in such an order that the thought comes out plain to the attentive reader. This movement has its three stages.

1. *The pyramid-builders.* Concerning these monarchs the report of the priests to Herodotus was very unfavorable. The first one, Cheops, "shut up all the temples and forbade sacrifices to the Gods," and then he "made all the Egyptians work for himself" in building his pyramid, which altogether took twenty years. Another tale of infamy is heaped upon this Cheops in regard to the degradation of his own daughter. He was succeeded by his brother, Chephren, of like character, who also built a great pyramid. The two brothers reigned 106 years, during which Egypt suffered all sorts of calamities, and "the temples were never opened." So we seem to catch a decided note of priestly hatred: "the Egyptians are not willing to mention their names, through hate of them."

Herein we certainly have to read the strong antagonism between king and priest, which expresses itself in the building of the pyramids versus the closing of the temples. But why should the priests develop such an opposition to the pyramid? It was the tomb of the king, to be built far greater than the abode of the God,

home of the priests. It probably indicates also a new religious direction, it is a tremendous struggle to build immortality in stone.

The pyramid seems a grand means of protection, a fortress raised against Time itself, in which fortress the body of the monarch is laid. The people grind out their life in erecting it; do they have no share, no spiritual participation, in the pyramid? I believe they do, it is their symbol too, in it they meet the negative power of Time, the all-devouring; they give Time this huge stone which he cannot digest. The Egyptian is thus trying to transcend the power of Time, not through mind, but through matter; by means of a temporal fortress he will shut out the temporal; by means of the sensible he will reach the supersensible. Desperate was the struggle; by the aid of their hands they wrought for salvation; they had to build something immortal here and now. The pyramid is an Egyptian document of immortality, a longing to last forever, an eternal sigh in stone for eternity.

I believe, therefore, that the pyramids express the consciousness of the Egyptian people at a certain stage of their national life. Not mere objects of tyranny; no absolute monarch could have erected them without the support of the people, by his mere arbitrary fiat. They express the overpowering feeling for immortality, the people's, not alone the king's.

But wherefore the antagonism of the priests? Very difficult to tell with exactness; still we do know that organized sacerdotalism is usually opposed to any new doctrine. The pyramid was certainly religious in origin; it was a kind of temple too, as against the old kind of temple. If we were to hazard a conjecture, it would be that the old religion had become too sensuous; the religion of the pyramids puts new stress upon the supersensible, the immortal. For the overwhelming effect of the pyramids lies in the fact that they seek to master in a direct grapple the very condition of the sense-world, namely Space and Time, by their two supreme characteristics, colossality and durability. The body lay mummified in the pyramid, but that was not enough; it was given a new body of stone of vast proportions, taking up Space into itself, and a new body of granite for the most part, which would defy Time. I cannot help regarding these pyramids built so impressively and with so much sincerity as monuments of a great religious Reformation which, like some other Reformations that might be mentioned, has remained in bad odor with the priests, or with a class thereof. So Cheops and Cephrenes, builders of the greatest monuments of Egypt and of Time, have been damned.

When the third pyramid-builder, Mycerinus, appears, it is plain that a reaction is setting in, or a compromise is taking place. Though the

son of Cheops, he "opened the temples again, and permitted the people to return to their sacrifices and employments;" also he was just in his decisions. Hence he is the most highly praised of all the kings that ever ruled in Egypt. Evidently he reconciled the opposing sides, still he built his pyramid too, though it was much smaller than either of the others. Thus the two diverse elements of faith began to get along together. It should be noted that the pyramids are not far from Memphis where was the great temple of Vulcan (Ptah). So they stood in rivalry.

After Mycerinus, the third pyramid builder, comes Asychis, who not only opened the temple of Vulcan (Ptah), but built a large and beautiful addition to it, a portico; manifestly there is a religious reaction. Still he too built a pyramid, he did not wholly abandon the new movement, though his pyramid was of brick, and his portico of the finest stone and workmanship. Moreover, can we not see that the tomb is becoming somewhat less sacred by the fact that the law can seize it for the benefit of the creditor? A living civil relation has become paramount to the sepulchre. So we may interpret this fact in connection with the new movement.

The next king is called the blind king, whose reign stands for internal trouble, and external interference. The Ethiopians enter and rule

Egypt which once ruled Ethiopia; a change which means decline, dissension, weakness. The foreign king at last left Egypt voluntarily on account of a dream, possibly the result of the priests working upon his superstition. At any rate the sacerdotal order gets the benefit of his withdrawal, since soon we find one of their order in possession of the throne.

2. *The Priest-king.* He doubtless represents the extreme of the reaction against the pyramid-builders, being a priest of Vulcan (of Ptah), whose temple we have already noted at Memphis, the rallying point against the pyramids. He "despised the military class," as not needing their services, thinking to do all now by a divine miracle, of which the flight of the Ethiopians is an example, and still more the undoing of the Assyrians under Sennacherib, through the field mice gnawing the bowstrings of their archers. In token of which miracle a statue of this king with a mouse on his hand stands in the temple of of Ptah (Vulcan) bearing the inscription "Whoever looks on me, let him revere the Gods." In all of which one cannot help feeling the sacerdotal influence.

Our historian now takes the opportunity of dilating upon theological topics, fit subject for a priestly reign. First is the idea of a great antiquity, the historic descent of the priesthood, counting in one case 345 generations — more

than 11,000 years — a kind of apostolic descent and transmission, here from father to son. That which was ancient was holy to the Egyptian; as we go backward in Time, we come nearer to the Gods, who are always first. Hence the priesthood were the conservators of the old, this is the ground probably of their difference with the pyramid builders.

Another claim is that in these 11,000 years and more, no God has assumed the form of a man. The Greek Hecataeus held that he, sixteen generations back, was derived from a God; the Egyptian priest Pyromis traced his genealogy 345 generations back without any God, which was his rebuttal of Hecataeus. The Greek has the idea strongly of divine sonship in many cases; the Egyptian and the Oriental consciousness generally reject it stoutly, hence they have not become Christian. So the old Egyptian would not allow men to be born of a God, in strong contrast with the Greek.

In the third place, Herodotus undertakes in a short account to translate the Egyptian Pantheon into the Greek one. It is indeed a difficult task. The chief mythus of Egypt, that of Osiris, Typhon (Seth), and Horus will not easily fit into any Greek account of Greek Gods — Osiris here being called Bacchus and Horus Apollo. Still further, the most recent Greek Gods are Pan, Hercules and Bacchus; but in Egypt Pan is

among the oldest Gods, and Hercules is in the second class; Bacchus, though among the newest Gods, goes back 15,000 years from the time of Amasis. All these Gods being new in Greece were transferred from Egypt to Hellas, "and so the Egyptians themselves relate;" they are the old parents of the Greeks.

It is manifest that the Egyptian priests were in the time of Herodotus making the attempt to connect their Gods with the Greek ones, claiming antiquity and even ancestry. The prestige of age they had, and our historian accepts it and reverences it. One other point may be mentioned, also connected with religion (142): the rising and the setting Sun changed places four times in these 11,000 years, which were reckoned to the reign of this priest-king, Sethon. Three-thousand years was the period of transmigration, which the Sun also measured, as it does the cycle of daily life.

It is evident that this priest-king gave up the defense of Egypt through its soldier class; the result is that after his reign the country fell to pieces. No less than twelve kings are ruling at once. So the priest governing the State destroys it, sacerdotalism has ever been destructive of the political element of a land. The former unity of Egypt is disrupted.

Still this dodecarchy, evidently a kind of confederacy, seeks to establish and perpetuate itself.

Friendship, treaties, intermarriages — such are some of the means of union, but the chief is the construction of the Labyrinth. It is claimed that these kings built the Labyrinth with twelve courts, three thousand rooms, one-half above ground and one-half below ground. So the dualism again shows itself, the here and the beyond, the known and the hidden. It contains the tombs of the kings who built it and of the sacred crocodiles.

3. *Psammetichus and Amasis.* The return to unity is now the movement; one king, Psammetichus, suppresses the division and unites Egypt again. But he does so by the aid of foreigners, who have already been reacting upon the land of the Nile from the West. Some Ionians and Carians from the coast of Asia Minor and from the Greek Islands of the Aegæan are thrown upon Egypt by stress of weather; these are the men of fate for the Egyptian people, inasmuch as they help Psammetichus gain the throne and become its chief upholders. This king, accordingly, gives the Greeks a foothold in Egypt, from which they have not been dislodged to this day. He assigned to them lands called “the Camps,” through which flowed a branch of the Nile. Note this other important fact: he caused Egyptian children to be trained in the Greek tongue, who became the interpreters. Also the children of these Greeks must have spoken both languages.

Psammetichus did not neglect the Egyptian and his religion. He too constructed a portico to Vulcan's temple facing southward, and built a court for Apis. The religious war is evidently at an end, the secular ruler is restored. But the great new thing is that Egypt is becoming Hellenized. It has a body of interpreters, who interpret Greek poetry and thought to Egypt, and Egypt to travelers.

In the reign of Apries, we observe that the Greek foreigners were creating trouble; the military class, who revolted and set up Amasis, were met by the Ionian and Carian auxiliaries to the number of 30,000. But Amasis found little favor among the native Egyptians who despised him as not being of an illustrious family; the result was he turned to the Greeks, and gave them a city Naucratis, and other places for trading as well as for their altars and temples. Nay, he dedicated offerings to the Greek Gods at Samos and elsewhere, as Croesus did. To be sure, he dedicated many works to the Egyptian deities also, especially at Sais (to Minerva). Greek philosophers, Solon and Pythagoras and Thales, visited Egypt during his reign and learned her wisdom. He broke down the castes of Egypt; he was himself a man of no standing in ancestry. He feels the new spirit rising in and around the Aegæan; he accepts it and is ruled by it. Psammetichus obtained the crown of the nation, united

by help of the Greek, and he was aided by their power, but Amasis was intellectually dominated by Greek spirit.

Herodotus declares (147) that he has other authority besides the Egyptians for what he says about this last dynasty from Psammetichus onward. Doubtless he means the Greeks. More historical he feels the account to be; in fact, the time begins to move into his chronological era, which starts from 100 to 200 years before his age. Perhaps if we heard the priests on Psammetichus and Amasis, we would have a different color in the narrative.

Thus we behold at the end of this Second Cycle of Egyptian History the new spirit, represented by the Greek, entering Egypt and really taking possession, through Amasis, the king. In a sense this is the destruction of Egypt, as the seed is destroyed by the sproutling. In another sense the Greek influence is the preservation of Egypt, it was joined to the World's History and still has its place in the World's Culture largely through Greece. A number of Greek writers for a thousand years and more sought to reveal the Egyptian secret to the world. For that which is mystery in the Egyptian must become revelation in the Greek. So the Greek has been the interpreter of the secluded, secretive people of the Nile to the world.

The Second Cycle began with a great struggle

in the land, that between king and priest; first the king triumphed, then the priest ruled and the country ended in complete disunion; this disunion was overcome by an Egyptian king calling in an external force, the Greek, who really displaces the Egyptian soldier, and causes him to migrate to Ethiopia. It looks as if the military and sacerdotal caste had undone each other. Really Greek power and Greek thought control Egypt.

Is Egypt to secede from the Orient and go over to Hellas? Such is the question which introduces the Persian upon the scene. Persia is now the grand bearer of the Orient, the conflict with Greece and the Occident has been already sharply defined, specially by Cyrus. His son Cambyses turns his attention to Egypt, which easily falls under the Persian yoke. So both, native king and Greek soldier, are set aside for a new dynasty and a new military power.

Note. It is to be observed that the preceding account of Herodotus does not agree with information from other sources, such as the lists of Manetho and Turin papyrus, and the monuments as deciphered by modern Egyptology. The period of the three chief pyramid-builders is thrown back to the Fourth Dynasty (about 4000 B. C.), and is supposed to have been preceded by other pyramid-builders. Thus the pyramids are declared to antedate by thousands

of years the great conquerors represented in Sesostris.

Still the names of the chief pyramid-builders as given by Herodotus are confirmed by the monuments, being designated on them as Khufu (Cheops), Khafra (Chephren), Menkaura (Mycerinus). Manifestly the guides of Herodotus were not trained archaeologists, nor was he. We, however, are, at present, studying Herodotus and are trying to place ourselves upon his standpoint; into the history of Egypt as found in modern text-books, there is here no intention of entering. That has become a great department of investigation by itself, with its own demands, methods and aims.

In the present case we are seeking to view the movement of Egyptian history as it was looked at by the Egyptian, or rather the Greco-Egyptian mind four and a half centuries B. C. Every age has its own way of regarding the events and movements of former ages; the history of preceding epochs has to be interpreted anew by each succeeding epoch. For us, looking back at the reign of King John of England, the main event is the Magna Charta. But for Shakespeare and for Shakespeare's England that was not the chief matter, the great poet of the English-speaking people never mentions the struggle over the Great Charter in his drama of *King John*, but does put stress upon the religious conflict with

Rome, this being the absorbing matter of interest in the Elizabethan age.

So the pyramids were regarded and interpreted in the light of the time, when the historian saw them; the consciousness of the present is projected backward into the remote past, and traces itself out of antiquity. Such a view is not false, but deeply genuine, and valid in its sphere.

OBSERVATIONS ON THE SECOND BOOK.

This Book is not an episode in the History of Herodotus, in the sense of being extraneous to the subject. On the contrary it is deeply, and we think, artistically adjusted to the conception of the historian, which is that of the World's History. Not always consciously present to him is this conception, still it is always at work and is the driving-wheel of his total history. Egypt has to be shown developing through itself, as an individual nation, in its secluded Nile valley, till it moves forth out of itself and is taken up into the world-historical process. Such we have already noted in the First Book to be the procedure of Herodotus; each people has its time of inner development, its national birth; then it breaks its bounds and reveals its internal power outwardly as a conqueror of other peoples; finally comes the period of dissolution within and subjugation without. Such is, in general, the movement of the Oriental nation.

The entire Book, accordingly, may be regarded as the movement of Egypt into the World's History. After its inner development, it is joined to the Persian Empire, whose function is to consolidate the whole Orient against Hellas. Egypt has felt many Hellenic influences, still it is Oriental and so belongs to Persia in this final mustering of nations in the present epoch. Later it will be ruled by a Greek dynasty.

I. SUMMARY OF EGYPTIAN HISTORY. It is manifest, then, that Herodotus gives, under names of kings, the movements or cycles which he sees in Egyptian History. He openly rejected much what the priests told him, being mainly a vast mass of names, years, dates, dynasties, without any visible order or inner principle. Nor was there apparently any chronological canon, except succession, almost as blank as Time itself. Still less did any poetic ordering come to light. So the historian, keeping up a kind of historic continuity of names, really puts the events, deeds, and great works under heads and arranges them through his artistic instinct into what we have named cycles.

These we shall briefly recapitulate.

1. *The first cycle* — old Egypt, considered as a unity; time of growth, the unfolding of the nation.

(1) Menes. Internal development; the founding of the capital (Memphis) and the management of the Nile.

(2) Sesostris. External conquest, with works at home.

(3) Proteus. Foreign influence, Greek especially, which is expressed mythically, however.

2. *The second cycle*.—Egypt disunited, separated within itself; national dissolution.

(1) The pyramid-builders; king versus priest, the religious breach.

(2) The priest is king; enemies (Assyrian and Ethiopian) miraculously driven off, still the country falls to pieces (the Dodecarchy).

(3) New unity of Egypt, not from within, but from without, by means of Greek mercenaries. Psammetichus to Amasis. Egypt now enters Greek history, and becomes a sharer in the historic continuity of Hellas and of Europe.

3. *The third cycle*.—This embraces the time of Herodotus and extends beyond him, as well as before him.

(1) The Persian rule, beginning with Cambyzes. (See next Book.) Thus Egypt is joined to the Orient in the Persian Empire, and is thrown against Greece in the great conflict.

(2) The Egyptians revolt from Persia, and are aided by Greeks, especially by the Athenians, who send their ships to the Nile. But Egypt remains Persian for the present; in this condition Herodotus sees it, probably not long after the period of the revolt of Inaros (B. C. 460). In general this epoch is a continued struggle as to

who shall have Egypt — Persia, Greece, or Egypt herself. Not fully settled till long after the time of Herodotus in favor of the Greek.

(3) The Ptolomies, Greek rulers of Egypt, who, however, fuse with the spirit of the people, and reign till its absorption into the Roman Empire. This brings Egyptian history down to the Christian Era.

Thus we see a Greek strand interweaving itself into Egypt through all three cycles, from Homer down, both mythically and historically. The old Nile-people, with all its wonders of art, custom, faith, had a great fascination for the impressionable Greek, who in every age has grappled with the sphinx-riddle, and sought to interpret the same. These interpretations have a history and, indeed, a significance of their own; we still have to consult them in order to understand Egypt, and also in order to understand the many-sided activity of the Hellenic mind. Accordingly, we shall give a brief abstract in the following:—

II. GREEK INTERPRETATIONS OF EGYPT. Along with the actual monuments of Egypt and its written records, we have to look into the successive Greek accounts, which are indeed the channel conducting the Egyptian stream into the world's culture. The interpretation of Egypt into Greek life and thought moved mainly on three lines, the mythical, the historical, and the philosophic, in each of which Greek spirit was at home.

(1) *The Greek mythical interpretation.* The grand separation and distinction of Hellas from the Orient and specially from Egypt was reflected in many a legend. First and best is the Homeric tale of Proteus in the *Odyssey*, which Menelaus tells to the Greek youth, Telemachus. The story of Oedipus is directly connected with the sphinx and her riddle, which the Greek has to guess or to perish. The Labyrinth and the Minotaur (the latter half man and half bull, and hence suggestive of Apis) appear in Crete, the borderland between Greece and Egypt; Theseus, the Greek hero, has to slay the monster (Egyptian) and to release its prey, who are children of the Greeks. Likewise in the legends of Danaus and of Perseus we trace the Hellenic relation to Egypt. So much for the early Greek mythus; but the Greek mythical spirit kept playing with Egypt and its wonders through the Alexandrian epoch till long after the Christian era.

(2) *The Greek historical interpretation.* Here in particular belongs Herodotus, whose visit to Egypt is usually placed 460–55 B. C. He combines, to a certain extent, all three ways of looking at Egypt. He has a mythical vein, also a touch of philosophical reflection here and there; still he is essentially the historian in the broadest sense.

Before Herodotus there were Greek historical investigators who visited Egypt. First, prob-

ably, was Hecataeus of Miletus (500 B. C.), who gave an account of the land of the Nile from personal observation, and whose work was remorselessly pillaged by Herodotus, according to modern writers who are fond of showing their critical ingenuity. Before the time of our historian we must also place Hellanicus, a Greek writer on things Egyptian.

After Herodotus comes a long list of Greek historians who treated of Egypt, but whose works have mostly perished. Diodorus Siculus, historian, who traveled in Egypt about 57 B. C., has preserved some valuable facts about the country in the First Book of his *Bibliotheca*. After the Christian Era many names appear as writers on Egypt in Greek, which had become the universal language of the learned—the Jew Josephus (born A. D. 37); Ptolomy, the geographer, of Alexandria (A. D. 160); the Christian St. Clement, of the same place and time. It is interesting to note that the Greek town Naucratis, in Egypt, set apart for the Greeks by King Amasis, produced a number of writers on Egypt. This town must have been an early home of guides and guide books for travelers in Egypt; Herodotus doubtless employed both.

Thus a stream of Greek writing, historical and descriptive, flows out of Egypt for ages; it was really this writing which explained and joined Egypt to the world of culture.

(3) *The Greek philosophical interpretation.* That class of men whom the Greeks first called philosophers, and thereby designated the dawn of a new stage of consciousness in the human mind, were in the habit of visiting Egypt from the start. The origin of Greek philosophy, therefore, has many an indication pointing back to the land of the Nile, from which at least it received no little impulse. Thales, Solon, Pythagoras, the earliest thinkers of Hellas, are all reported to have seen Egypt, and to have been students of its lore. Pythagoras is credited with having brought home the doctrine of metempsychosis, as well as his science of number. All of these philosophers lived in the sixth century B. C. One hundred years and more after them came Plato, the Athenian philosopher, who has also his Egyptian strand. Next we note Plutarch of Chaeroneia (125 A. D.) who translated and interpreted the Osiris myth for the Greek philosophic mind of his day. Finally the new Platonists, who wind up the movement of ancient philosophy, return on a number of paths to Egypt and the Orient; some of them indeed were Egyptians by birth. They come back to the One, inexpressible, above consciousness, the unknown; the Nile-stream in them seems to have whirled around to its sources hid in night. Thus the end of Greek philosophy returns to its Egyptian beginning and goes out

forever in presence of the new light, that of Christendom.

Not only on these three lines, through mythology, history and philosophy, did Egypt pass into the Greek soul, but also in other ways, notably through religion (Greek mysteries) and also through art (architecture and sculpture).

Thus we may catch some notion of the interest which the land of the Nile and its problem roused in the Greek mind. Such was indeed its deepest necessity. The Greek had always to solve the Egyptian riddle anew in order to transcend it and thus assert himself as Greek (see the Oedipus legend). The Egyptian offered to the Greek his intellectual problem, the Persian his political problem; both he had to answer or die.

This long Greek thread of information and speculation about Egypt has come down to us, broken in places, yet is our leading-string still in many matters. But in our own day the land and the people of the Nile have begun to talk again through their monuments, through their own sacred characters. The Sphinx, silent so long, silent to most of the Egyptians themselves in their own time, has strangely begun to speak in this nineteenth century.

The counter-process would be the Egyptian interpretation of the Greek world. But for whom? Only for themselves; Egypt had no

connection of her own with the movement of Universal History, or with the culture of the race. She was isolated, introverted, occupied with herself; her writing was kept secret, she refused to communicate what she was to the rest of mankind, perhaps she could not, being a mystery to herself. It was the Greek who revealed Egypt as far as she has been revealed. Still there are indications that the Egyptians were not altogether satisfied with the Greek interpretation of themselves. Hence arises the native historian.

III. MANETHO. Under the Greek rule of Egypt, we find a born Egyptian compiling and publishing a history of his country in Greek, in order to correct the mistakes of Herodotus and other Greek writers. Manetho was a priest himself, born at Sebennetus; he had access to the records of the Egyptian temples and proposed to reveal their contents. All this indicates a great change in the Egyptian mind; the priesthood evidently has begun to share in the historical spirit, and is going to tell Egypt's own story from an Egyptian standpoint (about 250 B. C.) Really, however, this is a result of Greek influence, that the Egyptian should undertake to interpret himself to the world.

But Manetho's work has perished, he probably did not succeed in revealing his people as well as the Greeks did. In fact, how could he? He

was too near his own to see them plainly. Only some of his lists of Egyptian dynasties have been preserved in extracts of other writers. In fact, the lists of his which we possess seem to be two removes or more from Manetho, not direct copies, but copies of copies. For instance, Julius Africanus, who copied Manetho, is lost, but we still have Georgius Syncellus, who copied Africanus. The list in Eusebius seems also to be a copy of a copy, though there is a doubt here.

But anyhow the whole is merely a dry list of names, truly an Egyptian mummy, or a mummified history. Such is this Manetho to us now. We are inclined to believe that when he was alive, he must have been a kind of mummy; indeed every Egyptian was probably. His book has probably found its natural outcome in its present stage of mummification. Herodotus has lived because he has life, movement, spirit. We must recollect that he could not digest that long list of 330 kings read to him by the priests at Memphis. Think of the sprightly, artistic, imaginative Greek tackling such a problem. But Manetho tackled it and died, all of him having quite vanished except this mummy of him.

Still Manetho has given prodigious occupation to the learned. As nearly everything about him and his dynasties is in a cloud of uncertainty, he offers the richest harvest for emendation, erudite conjecture, and sport of learned probabilities.

First comes the question: Are these thirty-one dynasties of Manetho all successive, or in part contemporaneous? The Egyptologers are still hammering away at this and other Egyptian riddles, as yet with no great success, though with much increase of material.

In addition to the lists of Manetho, there are other independent sources for the lines of the Egyptian monarchs. First in order comes the famous Turin papyrus, which, however, is in an imperfect, tattered condition. Then the monuments help out with many names and suggestions. It is needless to say that all this distracted material tumbled together is but little better than chaos, to which are to be added the learned conjectures and re-arrangements of the scheme by the Egyptologers, each one of whom has his own caprices in the business, as well as his merits.

In fact, when we read the modern Egyptologers we always have to think of the Egyptian priests recounting their endless lists of kings to Herodotus. For the most part a dry recital of names, dates and figures; the whole thing is as arid as the Libyan desert, as desiccated as a mummy. We cannot help taking the attitude of the old historian, who mentions the number merely, and is inclined to quit just there. "Here follows a list of 330 other kings," but what they did seems of little moment. Manetho, Egyptian that he was, took up the list of kings and dynas-

ties and flung it into the stream of time some two hundred years after Herodotus ; Manetho's successors, the Egyptologers, have been tinkering at it ever since, and still they cannot make it hold water. The interested outsider, not initiated into these Egyptian mysteries, reads with searching glances, and thinks with the old Greek historian, What shall I do with all these barbarous names and numbers, so devoid of any significant deeds or events, without any historic process in them visible? Herodotus at least gives a process and thus appeals to the human spirit ; he, some four hundred and fifty years before Christ, wheeled Egypt into line with the world-historical movement. Where is the man who can do the same for us and for our consciousness, more than twenty-three centuries later than Herodotus? We are still waiting for him.

IV. HERODOTUS IN EGYPT. When the historian (but now the traveler) set out from his native city Halicarnassus for his Egyptian journey is not known. He entered Egypt at the western or Canobic mouth of the Nile, passed up stream till he came to the Greek settlement at Naucratis. Here he found his countrymen from Asia Minor in large numbers, yet intermingled with many crosses between Greek and Egyptian. His own townsmen, the Halicarnassians, were doubtless well represented ; with some of these he may have been personally acquainted or

related by blood; he, being of a well-known family, would be hospitably received. Letters of introduction he may have had too; and when he set out from Naucratis to see the real Egypt, he probably bore his testimonials from his Greek friends there to Egyptians at Sais, Memphis, and elsewhere.

Naucratis in the time of Herodotus must have been a lively Greek town, with its market place, its wineshops, its temples and porticos, all of them resorts for talkative people. To these places he would go in order to hear the news, for this was the ancient Greek substitute for the newspaper. Particularly would he there catch the Greco-Egyptian character and tendency; besides, he would learn much from experienced persons about Egypt, her people and her customs. He would hear his own tongue, chiefly his own familiar dialect, as most of the inhabitants of Naucratis were from Asia Minor. Many tales which we find in his Egyptian History bear the stamp of the story-telling Greek of Naucratis. Also he could hear more solid information concerning geography, customs, religion.

Such, in general, was the first training-school of Herodotus in Egypt. He obtained a general survey of his subject before starting; he caught the transformation which the land of the Nile undergoes in passing through the Hellenic mind. It must not be forgotten that Naucratis was

already one hundred years old when Herodotus arrived there. Three generations of Greeks had been born in the town. But the Greeks had been settled much longer in Egypt; Psammetichus nearly two hundred years before the visit of Herodotus had given them a foothold in his realm; this was the king who put Egyptian youths under the care of Greeks to be instructed in the Greek language; "from these the present interpreters in Egypt are descended" (154). So not only the commercial but the intellectual intercourse between Hellas and Egypt had been established, and even fostered by law quite two centuries before Herodotus. The result of this intercourse, the Greco-Egyptian spirit, is really what the historian has caught in the pages of his book and transmitted to us in permanent form. Naucratis was his central point, he must have remained there quite a while at first, and have made excursions into the neighboring cities of the Delta. The work, therefore, which Herodotus has given had been in the process of making for several centuries, being essentially the Greek interpretation of the Egyptian world.

At Naucratis our traveler, therefore, would find matters prepared for him. There were guide-books; the names of several Greeks of Naucratis who wrote on Egypt have been handed down. We can also imagine him taking lessons in Egyptian, in the conversational tongue of the

people, of which there must have been teachers in that Greek town, though nobody probably could explain to him the hieroglyphics. Thus he could help himself out with bits of conversation on his journeys. Moreover, there is hardly any doubt that he had some knowledge of Persian. He was born under Persian rule, and the language of Persia was the official language of every important place in Asia in his time; it was also the official language of Egypt at the time of his visit; as Persian subject he probably had his privileges. It is certainly within the range of probability that he knew something of other tongues.

By such statements it is not meant to affirm that he knew any of these languages in a critical sense, as they are known by a modern philologist. Probably no Greek and no Persian had any idea of the affinity between Greek and Persian, though speaking both tongues; the modern philologist knows that affinity though able to speak neither tongue. Most writers on Herodotus seem to take for granted that he was acquainted with no language except Greek, but it is a purely gratuitous assumption, and contrary to the probabilities of the case. It is true that his linguistic knowledge is without any background of Comparative Philology, and hence he is liable to make mistakes; but such mistakes are far from proving total ignorance, especially

in the matter of speaking. It is highly probable that Herodotus studied, heard and practiced conversational Egyptian during his stay at Naucratis.

While remaining in the Greek town, he could make many a profitable excursion from it as a center in the company of guides or of friends. A short distance up the stream from Naucratis lies the ancient Egyptian city of Sais, which had its own special Goddess, Neit, the unbegotten mother of the Sun, whom the Greeks identified with Pallas Athena (Minerva) of their own Pantheon. From this city Psammetichus started forth and freed Egypt with the aid of the Ionians and Carians (152), to whom he then gave a permanent home in Egypt, which was still further confirmed by Amasis. Herodotus must have seen its great festival; indeed it is likely that he visited many of these cities of the Delta at the period of their various festivals in honor of their particular deities. From Naucratis he could go to most of them in a boat at the specified time, accompanied by Greek friends and sightseers, for the latter were never wanting in that Greek town. In one of these excursions he went to Heliopolis, the city of the Egyptian Ra, the sungod, home of Egyptian learning, where Plato is known to have studied, and where the earlier Greek philosophers probably received their Egyptian learning.

When the traveler was fully ready, he transferred his headquarters from Naucratis to the great capital of Northern Egypt, Memphis. Not far off were the pyramids and other marvels. The results of his stay at Memphis appear throughout the Second Book, especially in the historical portion. The great temple of Ptah (Vulcan), whose history is closely connected with the entire political and economical development of Egypt, was a subject of special study. From Memphis he passed into Southern or Upper Egypt, going as far as Elephantine, according to his own statement.

But he has not much to say of Upper Egypt and its wonders, its temples, its tombs, its capital, the hundred-gated Thebes. He has already written as much about Egypt as the plan of his total work will permit; we have already seen how short he cuts his account of the conquests of Cyrus in the previous Book; his Greek sense of proportion would be violated by too much detail concerning Egypt. He is writing a World's History, not an Egyptian History; has he not already given sufficient for his purpose? He has told what was necessary; so let Egypt next be shown absorbed into the Persian Empire.

Undoubtedly Upper Egypt had been less influenced by the Greeks, was less accessible and less friendly to them than the Delta. It was also quite out of the range of the historian's central

point, Naucratis, which we hold to have been the pivot of his Egyptian travels. Less information about it was attainable; probably, too, at the time of the historian's visit it was in an unsettled condition politically; the Persian authorities had not so strong a grip upon it as they had upon the cities of the North.

Still it is wholly unauthorized (and indeed calumnious) to say that he never saw Thebes and Upper Egypt, in the face of his own declarations and the probabilities of the case. Even more unjustifiable is the attack upon his integrity, when he is charged with plagiarizing and appropriating the work of preceding travelers (such as Hecataeus) without acknowledgment. (See Rev. Prof. Sayce's very unfriendly and unwarrantable statements in his Book, *The Egypt of the Hebrews*.) There are many mistakes of fact in the Herodotean account of Egypt, but they are honest mistakes, though his calumniators have often sought not only to disprove his declarations, but also to impugn his character. Let the good Christian (even if he be a minister) show himself as candid, as fair-minded, as universally charitable as this old heathen historian.

V. SOME EGYPTIAN TOPICS.—The Nile river flows through all Egypt, not only physically but spiritually; it makes the peculiar soil and moulds the peculiar mind of that country; the Egyptian is individualized, is made an Egyptian, through

the Nile, which must, therefore, be seen putting its impress upon institutions, arts, customs, religion, character. The people cling to their river like parasites; they deem themselves one with its animals, its bugs and beetles; all are the sacred spawn of the Nile slime.

Art. Egypt is supremely a land of formative art, had to be such as a true child of the Nile, which pouring down from the unknown into the known, begets millions of forms, animal and vegetable, high and low. The people must behold these shapes of the divine Provider; the Egyptian will become an artificer, even artist. There will not be simply an imitation of nature, but a play of the imagination, the symbol-making activity. For the Nile has its unseen, nay, its eternal element, and the artist must give this also, or suggest it, in his sensuous shapes, else he will not adequately express the truth of the Nile, which by its very character compels him to manifest the invisible in the visible.

The Egyptian, in his mighty struggle for expression, will not follow Nature and simply copy her shapes, he will unite where Nature separates, he will mingle animal and human parts in every conceivable way, in order to show forth the forms of his Gods. The Nile, working through the imagination of the artist, produces with its dual character the Sphinx, half man half beast. Thus Egypt becomes the great birth-place of

artistic monstrosities, all of them children of Father Nile.

Colossality, too, these works will show, which is the striving to make the known reveal the unknown, to force the finite to hold the infinite; the little Nile here must manifest the Great Nile yonder; the seen Nile hand on this side must somehow make an image of the unseen Nile body beyond, in all its magnitude. Pyramids, Tombs, Temples, Statues, and Monuments of various kinds have in the main this spirit of colossality; Architecture is specially its art.

Hieroglyphics are pictures of the Nile animals which also must represent an unseen element along with the seen; that is, a spiritual counterpart begins to enter the physical sign, which thus has not only an outer form, but also an inner meaning. Therein writing has begun, and the communication between man and man through the written symbol.

These hieroglyphics have the forms of animals mainly, yet they have a significance of their own, apart from the mere form. Each has thus a seen and an unseen element, and therein corresponds to the Nile, which incarnates itself in living shapes. Each hieroglyphic is a kind of new incarnation; the pictured animal, visible, assumes a new meaning, invisible, of the spirit. All writing indeed has this seen and unseen principle in it; what is this word before you but

a seen outer form with an unseen inner signification? Our alphabet is probably derived from the Egyptian hieroglyphic, which became hieratic and demotic in Egypt, and then passed to the Phoenicians, who changed the picture to a sound-sign, and so made an alphabet. From Phoenician to Greek this alphabet was transmitted, thence to Roman and to Anglo-Saxon. The English letters before you are traceable back to the Nile stream, which pours through all that you read, in a far-off undercurrent; all writing is an incarnation of the unseen, first wrought out in Egypt and first suggested by its sacred River. The Nile, in many a subtle transformation, is still pouring through us all.

The ancient Egyptian language survives in the modern Coptic, if indeed the latter be not now quite extinct. But the Coptic letters are derived from the Greek alphabet, with some additions, it is said, from the Demotic. The early Christian missionaries, in converting the Egyptians, found it necessary to change their old style of writing, though the language itself remained. The hieroglyphic was indeed a kind of sacred picture, an idol; with it was connected the ancient worship, and it would always call back the old Gods of the Nile. Moreover, the new idea had to have a new body, a new incarnation as it were, very remote from the animals and insects of the Nile slime. The change from picture-writing to

alphabetic writing was a mighty step in the development of the ages, and was involved in the movement from the Egyptian to the Christian religion. Still that old faith of the Nile valley has thrown out many fibers which have unfolded and become ingrown with our beliefs.

Religion. Art is most intimately connected with religion; to give outer form to the God is indeed a necessity for the primitive man, and even civilized peoples do not so easily renounce it. That which the soul adores as invisible and universal, must be made to appear to the worshiper; thus religion calls forth art.

The Egyptian worshiped animals, for the Nile incarnated himself in animal life; his inner unseen principle seemed to pass over into the inner vital motion of insect and crocodile; the unknown thus shows itself and takes on body. Among the Nile animals we may reckon man himself in his specialized Egyptian character, for man is also a living thing, sharing in the grand mystery of life, yet he is only one form of the many incarnations of the Nile.

Metempsychosis is suggested therefore, by the Nile, which has a permanent principle amid all its transformations. The individual appears, vanishes, and re-appears with the Nile, which has the immortal element undergoing all these changes. The Greek doctrine of transmigration did not naturally take to the animal form,

but was inclined to keep the human form (Pythagoras and Plato). Egypt, however, must cling to all the Nile shapes, of which the human frame is but one; hence the Egyptian, man and God, is re-incarnated in the lower orders of life, lower to us at least.

Immortality of the soul is bound up with this doctrine of the transmigration of the soul. It may be said that in Egypt was the one early battle-ground to preserve the individual from death. Can individuality be immortal, preserving itself from being swallowed up in a pantheistic All or Nothing? Egypt says distinctly it can, but it must take other bodies, which are already being individualized by the creative power of Father Nile. Soul in itself is not fully free and complete, is not fully individualized as yet in Egypt, without assuming the new living body, "the gift of the River." The Egyptian soul is not certain of itself separated from the body, hence the embalming, the pyramid, the rock-built tomb, as well as transmigration. Some writers have said that the soul, after its long wandering through the thousands of Nile shapes, after its long discipline, sinks back into Osiris and is one with him; if so, then the Egyptian individual is lost after all in a kind of pantheistic world-soul.

We must think that, as regards the doctrine and worth of immortality in the development of the race, a most important step was taken in

Egypt. The Nile is immortal, it keeps flowing year in and year out, yet with a difference; it shows a rise and a fall, birth and decline, it has a permanent and a transitory element, in which the dawning soul of man will gradually see itself, and come to a consciousness of its own dual nature, its mortal and its immortal portions. The Nile thus is a grand education for its people, becoming a symbol which reveals themselves to themselves.

The Nile body remains, even after the freshet has deposited its sediment, and the principle of growth and vitality has vanished out of the stream. Life departs, the body remains, that body of the Nile; so the human shape must be preserved after life — hence embalment. The new body of the Nile, returning with the new season, brings the principle of life into the old body. Such too must be man's cycle. Above any other duty apparently was the duty of embalming, to the ancient Egyptian; the poor, the drowned, the unknown must have their corpses, when found, embalmed at public expense. Four hundred millions of human mummies are estimated to have lain in the land of Egypt, besides untold quantities of animal mummies. For the animal too was the offspring of Father Nile and contained his immortal principle. If the Nile passes into the beast, so must man, yes, so must the God.

Yet here multiplicity enters and brings confusion. Some towns of Egypt worship one animal, some another; some worship one God and some another. Some adore the crocodile (Crocodilopolis), and some reject its divinity, but take another animal. These differences are said to have caused wars between Egyptian cities. Thus the Egyptian Pantheon becomes chaotic, self-assailing, a veritable Pandemonium, with struggling mortals as its instruments. The list of Gods is as confused as the list of kings; for thousands of years in Upper and in Lower Egypt we find deities cotemporaneous and in succession. Still there is a unity of principle in all this wriggling mass of Gods, the spawn of the Nile stream.

The mummy speaks its word still to those who are ready to listen, and among other things it says that spirit has not yet attained supremacy over nature, the soul cannot do without the body, each has quite equal validity; the human and the animal belong together, as represented in the sphinx and in thousands of other shapes. Such is, indeed, the image of the Egyptain dualism.

The Hebrew will quit the land of Egypt and carry with him the faith in the pure spirit; the God is one, hostile to nature and often to man; the finite, the sensuous is remorselessly extirpated, the animal (the golden calf) must not be worshiped. The eternal, imperishable element

of the Nile does not for the Hebrew need the Nile valley with its thousandfold shapes in nature and art; the plastic work becomes an idol, a devil fit only to be broken. Thus the Nile, with changed course, will flow into Palestine and thence down the ages.

Osiris is the youngest, yet the greatest God of Egypt; he lives, dies, and is restored; he represents the process of life, death, resurrection. Egypt's fanes were full of lamentations, those of Greece had dancing and song and festivity, though the dying God was known in Crete under the name of Zeus; he doubtless came from the Nile. The other-worldliness of Egypt was indeed its most impressive trait, it was supremely the land of tombs, and of religious ceremonies and mysteries. The old Egyptian must often have been himself a kind of living mummy, being occupied so much with the beyond. Very naturally the Egyptians had their descent to Hades (Amenti), which also was a phase of the Greek religious conception, as we see in the cases of Ulysses, Hercules, Orpheus, etc. The Homeric Hades, as given in the *Odyssey*, was probably outlined in part from the Nile, as the *Odyssey* in a number of ways shows the influence of Egypt.

The religion of Egypt had also its negative, diabolic powers. There was the enemy of Osiris, Set, who has an essential part in the dying God,

being a stage of the process. Aphophis is the serpent, evil, Satan, often pictured on the monuments. He, too, entered the garden of the Nile, was there probably before he entered the Hebrew Eden, which was likewise a kind of river-garden.

The Sun and the Nile. Their relation is very intimate in the Egyptian mind. The Sun has his cycle, first the diurnal one, secondly the annual one, which latter brings with itself the changes of the seasons and also the changes of the Nile. Undoubtedly the Nile was the more important of the two, and, as already said, the determining physical fact for Egypt. The Sun seems to move with the River, the two are counterparts, one takes a celestial and the other a terrestrial course. So the Nile rose to the skies, and there flowed through the year, with increase and decline, with heat and cold, making summer and winter, to which the Nile below responded, with his rise and fall. The solar Nile has his path through the heavens (the ecliptic), also his broad stream-bed (the zodiacal belt), nay, his animals made of stars (the constellations of the zodiac). The twelve signs through which the Sun passes in his annual cycle are composed of animals, human and lower; so the Nile luminary of the skies produces and deposits his shapes made of light. Zodiac is derived from a word which means animal (or little animal), and had its beginning in Egyptian

astronomy, showing a mystical connection with the River, from which connection it was released by Greek science. Some writers, however, affirm that the idea of the Zodiac goes back to the Chaldean, or to the Hindoo astronomers. But its origin was in the Egyptian soul, which saw it begotten of the Sun and the Nile-stream, whence it passed to Hellas, where it was separated from its terrestrial parent (the Nile), and became simply a celestial object.

The Labyrinth seems to have been a symbolic structure, having reference to the Sun and the Nile. It had "two kinds of rooms, some above ground and some below ground," an upper and a lower, a celestial and a terrestrial, a seen and an unseen division; Herodotus was not permitted to see the underground chambers. A suggestion of the zodiac lies in this: "to the Labyrinth belong twelve courts" with roofs and colonnades; "six courts are turned to the North, six to the South," separated into these two sides by an equatorial line, as it were; "the whole is enclosed by the same exterior wall." If the Nile was raised to the skies, and produced the zodiac, this zodiac is now brought down to earth and reproduced in a work of art. Still further "there are three thousand chambers," half above and half underneath the earth's surface, hinting the cycle of transmigration doubtless; "the underground chambers contained

the sepulchers (mummies) of the royal builders and of the sacred crocodiles," but were not seen by the profane eyes of the foreign traveler, in spite of his reverential awe. This Labyrinth is said by Herodotus to have been constructed by the twelve kings, when Egypt was divided into twelve kingdoms or nomes, and the government (the Dodecarchy), had apparently adjusted itself to the celestial divisions of the zodiac. Thus had the Nile land received politically the impress from above, and its rulers proceeded to embody this same impress in a colossal work of art, bringing down the Beyond into the Here. But the first builder of the Labyrinth is now deemed to have been Amunemhat III., the sixth king of the twelfth dynasty, whom the Greeks called by the name of Myris. The likelihood is that the work was a growth, a product of many ages, with the cycle of the Nile transferred above and joined to that of the Sun, then brought back to earth and reincorporated in art, specially in architecture.

With the Sun and the Nile enters the idea of the measurement of Time, to which the Egyptian gave no small attention. Still he had no chronological canon or historical clock, no era, which is indeed impossible till the conception of a World's History has arisen. Even then it is a matter of slow growth, as we may see in the case of Herodotus himself. Egypt, the exclu-

sive, could not create a chronological era and order her history by it; the two elements of historical chronology, succession and contemporaneousness, are hopelessly jumbled together in her lists of kings, and in the periods of her monuments. What rulers and even what dynasties are successive, and what contemporaneous? Herodotus could not say; probably Manetho himself, though an Egyptian priest with Greek culture did not and could not. Egyptian kings and dynasties are as badly mixed as Egyptian Gods and systems of Gods.

Still there is, we hold, a spiritual order cognizable in these Egyptian matters, though the chronological order cannot be ascertained, except within certain general limits. The Time-garment of the Egyptian Idea is exceedingly loose, still the Idea is there and is knowable. But now the exclusive, solitary condition of Egypt is to be broken up, she is to be brought into the movement of the World's History, and share in the grand conflict which opens the historic consciousness of the race.

BOOK THIRD.

This Book as a whole shows an important stage in the advance of Persia toward her great end, which is the conflict with Hellas. The vast Empire is getting ready without and within for its historic destiny; to which we see all things tending. The movement toward the consolidation of the Orient, which we noted in the First Book, continues. In the first place, Egypt is conquered by the new Persian king, being taken away from its Hellenized ruler and joined to the countries of Western Asia under a common authority. This makes the Orient a unit, as far as it was known to Herodotus, who begins to indicate the limits surrounding it in Africa and in Asia, to designate the Rim of Barbarism which

encompasses the more civilized peoples. In the second place, there is a decided step forward toward Greece itself in the subjection of Samos, an island of the Egean, where Polycrates was tyrant and had his so-called Thalassocracy (rule of the sea). Thus the Persians have conquered the last remaining obstacle between themselves and continental Hellas ; they have subjugated the Greek sailor, though they were no sailors ; the lordship of the Greek sea is to be the bridge over to Europe and the Occident. In the third place, Persia undergoes an internal change ; she obtains a new ruler who organizes the vast, unwieldy empire, bringing it into something like order and unity.

Such are the chief matters which the historian is to unfold in this Third Book. We feel here a spirit moving which we have sought to grapple and designate by calling it world-historical. Egypt has been more or less isolated hitherto ; she has lived her own confined life in the valley of the Nile, sometimes conqueror, sometimes conquered ; now she is to be wheeled into line with the other peoples of the Orient, and is made to share in the mighty enterprise which is really the begetting of History in the universal sense. On the other hand, in regard to Samos the narrative clearly shows that she could not become the grand bearer of the principle of the Occident ; her government was a tyranny, and hence too

like Persia; nor would she get rid of it and expel her tyrants as Athens did. So Samos falls, as Croesus fell, being neither the one side nor the other, but somewhere between; she was not the true representative of the Hellenic cause, though we see that many Samians protested against tyranny. It was not the smallness or the poverty of Samos that incapacitated her; Athens in the Persian War was smaller and poorer, yet became the real leader of the Hellenic spirit in the great struggle. Samos was the first Greek city of this epoch and had "the three greatest works that have been accomplished by the Greeks" (60) comparable only with those of Egypt.

We shall in advance take a look into the structure of the present Book. It is divided into two main portions, of which the first brings before us the two tyrants and their doings — Cambyses and Polycrates, Persian and Greek. The second portion shows the fates of the two tyrants, along with the manifold vicissitudes of their respective governments, Persia and Samos. Thus two Threads of Narration run through both portions, namely, the Greek and the Persian Threads, being deftly interwoven in each portion; these two threads, as we shall often notice, pass through this entire History of Herodotus, forming indeed the double element of its composition as well as the conflict which it describes.

The following gives the structural outline of the Book :—

- I. The two tyrants and their deeds (1-60).
 1. The first Persian Thread — Cambyses (1-38).
 2. The first Greek Thread — Polycrates (39-60).
- II. Fates of the two tyrants — events of Persia and Samos (61-159).
 1. The second Persian Thread (61-119).
 2. The second Greek Thread (120-149).
 3. The third Persian Thread (150-159).

Such is the skeleton of the Book, suggested by its structure, its vital principle, or the thought which governs it. But there will be many an excursion into other adjoining domains; the historian will interweave fact, fancy, tale, anecdote, reflection, in fine the whole varied consciousness of his time. He does not feel himself called upon to confine himself to the bare historic event; that is but a fragment in the total picture of the age, as he beholds it and portrays it. He will tell the wonders of the barbaric borderland both in Africa and in Asia; such an account is indeed necessary, when we come to see into his procedure. Geography, ethnography, manners and customs of peoples are introduced by the way, and stories of personal adventure (like that of

Democedes) find their place in the movement of the Whole.

The historian still works-in his idea of nemesis; he shows his faith strongly in the return of the deed upon the evil-doer, and from this point of view he gives a dramatic turn to his record of mighty personages. Cambyses and Polycrates, tyrants, get back their own in the final act; their doom is written in their deeds. Thus into the forward-moving historical stream is inwrought a cyclical movement of individual destinies, usually tragic; the great man, high-placed, is overwhelmed by the fates of his own conduct, though a new world is brought forth through his career. Successive is history, the individual is cyclical.

I.

The two tyrants, Cambyses and Polycrates, are brought together by way of contrast as well as of similarity in the first portion of the Book (1-60). They are the centers of important movements of their time, as well as rulers of their respective countries. In the one we may behold the Persian boundlessless, the rasping against all external limitation, the greed of conquest, coupled with the reaction internally, the effect of tyranny upon the tyrant himself. In the case of the Greek we may observe the outer reaction of Greece, seeking to get rid of her

great tyrant, and indicating that such a ruler is deeply antagonistic to the Hellenic spirit. There is a Samian party hostile to him in his own island, then Sparta as the head of Greece sends an army against him. Still the stroke of destiny comes to Polycrates from a Persian source, not from a Greek. He is a middle power whom both sides disown and seek to put down; lying in the sea, between Hellas and Asia, Samos and the rule of Polycrates must be absorbed. He favored Cambyses in the latter's invasion of Egypt, then he is himself swallowed in turn.

1. *The First Persian Thread* (1-38). The historian proceeds to give an account of the conquest of Egypt by Cambyses, son of Cyrus (usually placed in the year 525 B. C.), who conquers king Psammenitus after a short reign of six months. Cambyses' stay in Egypt lasted some seven or eight years, according to the generally received chronology; the king never returned to Persia after once entering the land of the Nile. The narrative of the historian we shall look at under three heads: the successful conquest of Egypt, the unsuccessful attempt to pass beyond the limits of Egypt, the rebound upon the character of Cambyses.

(1) It is important to observe the manner of the historian in probing for the origin of the war between Egypt and Persia. Three possible causes he gives, all of them resting on personal

grounds — the trick of Amasis, the boyish pledge of Cambyses to his mother, the desertion of the Greek Phanes. Thus does gossip play around the great event and seek to account for it; most wars, ancient and modern, have been traced to personal spite and ambition, or even to the petty intrigues of women. Such may be the little taper which starts the conflagration; but the combustibles must be ready, piled together by another hand, if there is to be much of a blaze.

The deeper cause of this Perso-Egyptian conflict we are to recognize. The time has come when Egypt is to be torn from her exclusiveness and self-occupation, and compelled to start in the great world-historical movement of the Orient, of which Persia is the leader and the representative. Egypt now really joins the historic continuity of the race, is forced to join it; history she has had hitherto, but no World's History; a national history, even an Asiatic history, dim and fragmentary, but no World's History, which is indeed just now beginning to be, having been born of this struggle between Hellas and the Orient. The surging of Asiatic peoples over one another, down and up, now conquering, now conquered, is hardly history, certainly not Universal History.

It may be well to note here that we see in Herodotus three phases of historic movement: first is a national or internal history, such as the

Lydian, Median, Persian, Egyptian; second is the international imperial phase, which brings several Asiatic nations together by subjugation; third is the world-historical phase, which is begotten of the mighty collision between Orient and Occident, of this Persian conflict between Greece and Asia. Such is indeed the ultimate cause of the war, including all other minor causes.

Egypt apparently made no stout resistance to the Persian invader, she belonged to him in the due order of things. The land was defended by foreigners mainly, by Ionian and Carian mercenaries, not by native soldiery, who, according to one story, had quit Egypt. Evidently there was no national spirit flaming up for the defense of home and country; nor could the Greek soldier have had much interest in the struggle as a Greek. Under Amasis Hellenic influence was powerful in the land; but we may reasonably suppose that Egypt was too Greek for the Egyptian, and too Egyptian for the Greek. She easily yielded to the Oriental, who was probably more to her liking than the Occidental intruder.

Moreover, we learn that the neighboring people, the Arabians, furnished a passage to the Persian king through their desert, and provided him with water. Here was some enmity, possibly some jealousy of the Greek. Once the Arabians ruled Egypt, had there a dynasty of kings, and

always traded with the valley of the Nile. Phanes, the deserter, must have known of this Arabian feeling; he was certainly in a position to know it, being stationed near the border with the Greek troops. Hence his advice to the Persian "to send ambassadors to the Arabians and make a treaty with them."

(2) The Persian, having conquered Egypt, cannot rest in its bounds, he is driven by his own boundless spirit against the Rim of Barbarians, which surrounds Egypt, especially on the South; he hurls himself against the Ammonians of the desert on the West, and contemplates an expedition against the Carthaginians. On all sides he impinges against the limits of Egypt by land and even by sea; he cannot endure any territorial restraint. Such we have already noticed to be a characteristic of Persian spirit.

Now these far-off lands, beyond the pale of ancient civilization, are just the realm of wonders and the theme of the Marvelous Tale. The myth-making faculty begins to play on the line outside of the domain of the known fact; peoples which have no history are handed over to the imagination. Thus around the whole Persian Empire, except where it borders on Greece, is a fringe of Wonderland which is a kind of transition from the known world to the unknown, the twilight of fable lying between day and darkness. Our historian will always lapse into romance

when he comes to this twilight border of the world; his spirit responds at once to its character, and he springs from the historical to the mythical with a decided relish.

Cambyses sends messengers to the Long-lived Ethiopians "who dwell in that part of Libya which borders upon the South Sea." A remote, marvelous people; they have a Table of the Sun, to which every sort of meat comes already cooked, and he who wishes partakes, the earth itself producing these bounties; a kind of *Schlaraffenland*, where the dove flies into the hungry human mouth, just broiled aright. Those Ethiopians were also "the tallest and handsomest of all men," quite different from the Ethiopians of these days. Moreover, their king, chosen because he is the largest and strongest man of the nation, sends back this stunning reply to the Persian monarch: "He is not a just man; for if he were just, he would not desire any other territory than his own; nor would he reduce people to servitude who had done him no injury." Thus is the grand Persian sin set forth from the Greek point of view by that distant Ethiopian king.

Nor is this all. He sends a huge bow, his own, with the taunt: when the Persian king can bend this, let him make war upon me. So the Bending of the Bow comes up again as the test of strength, as in many a legend, notably in

that of Ulysses. The Long-lived Ethiopians attained often the age of one hundred and twenty years, and sometimes even more, but evidently falling short of the Hebrew patriarchs; their food was meat and milk, not grain, which in their eyes was but "dung," or the product thereof, and not fit to be eaten. And they had a fountain, a veritable El Dorado, in which they bathed, whereby the body became as sleek as if oiled, and a fragrance rose from it as of violets. This is what gave them long life, truly another Fountain of Youth. Many other wonders are seen; finally the tomb is shown; the corpse is preserved in the semblance of life, by a preparation, and encased in a transparent casket, which is set up in the household for a year; thus the dead are not absent from the family gathering. Such a treasure of legend do we suddenly come upon among these Long-lived Ethiopians far away to the South.

Cambyzes, "madman that he was," proposed to march against this people, "not taking into account that he was going to make an expedition to the extremes of the earth." Of course he failed utterly, he could not enter this legendary land, the limit was fixed against him and he had to fall back. Even more disastrous was his expedition against the Ammonians; his whole army was overwhelmed in the sand storm of the desert before it could reach its destination.

(3) Thus from all three directions Cambyses is thrown back upon Egypt, from an inhabited land, from the desert, from the sea. The limit is drawn strongly upon him, he finds the boundary to his will and to his empire from without. But he still has no boundary from within, he gives himself up to unmeasured caprice, which becomes at last insanity. For he gets to thinking that the world is a caprice, without order, without law; the man who holds that the world is irrational, must become irrational himself. The picture of Cambyses, the irresponsible Oriental despot, is drawn by a Greek hand for Greek readers, but it is psychologically true and is verified by the fact.

The disease which comes of absolute authority has been outlined by the great English poet in one of his most completely elaborated characters. King Lear, once absolute monarch, has limit after limit put upon him by his own daughters, till he sinks away into insanity like Cambyses. Unlimited power has the tendency to make the man crazy who is born to it and exercises it from youth. Xerxes shows a touch of madness, though his father, Darius, seems to have been free of it, having had to acquire his authority. The Roman Emperors, Nero, Caligula and others had mental disease, evidently begotten of their position; Russian Czars have shown a mad strain; and is not something the matter with the

present German Kaiser? The impressive lesson from Shakespeare's *Lear* is that absolute authority is more dangerous to the person who exercises it than to the people over whom it is exercised, though the latter live at the peril of a caprice.

Cambyzes quite fills the definition of a tyrant given later (80): "he changes the institutions of the ancestors, wrongs women, puts men to death without trial." We see Cambyzes assailing the customs and belief of the Egyptians: he killed Apis and scourged the priests; he desecrated the temples, and scoffed at the Egyptian Gods. Nor did he respect Persian law and custom: he marries his own sister, violates sepulchres, burns dead bodies — the latter being a sacrilegious act, since the Persians believe fire to be a God (16) who is not to be polluted with a corpse. Finally he slays his own brother and sister, having become a monster who devours his own family.

Any limit put upon him he resents as if it were the most heinous crime; any advice is a wrong against majesty. Upon his own inquiry, Prexaspes, his most trusted friend, dares to tell him that the Persians "say you like wine too well." Whereupon Cambyzes shows that he is sober by drawing his bow and shooting through the heart his cup-bearer, the son of Prexaspes. Croesus admonishes him: "Do not so completely give

way to youth and passion, but restrain yourself," put yourself in bounds. Whereat Cambyses: "Dost thou presume to give advice to me," to me the absolute monarch! For certainly advice means limitation, even limitation of wisdom. "Give me my bow," but Croesus jumped up and ran out.

Such is the lively portrait of the Oriental despot going mad through lack of self-restraint; he finds an external, but no internal limit. Now we are to pass to another kind of tyrant, the kind which Greece produced in its movement from the heroic to the historic age. The main example is Polycrates of Samos, but Periander tyrant of Corinth is introduced by the way with his fateful drama.

2. *The first Greek Thread* (39-60). "While Cambyses was invading Egypt, the Lacedemonians sent an army against Samos and Polycrates," its tyrant. Such is the historian's method of connecting events in time. He has no established era, by which to measure each people in its movement through the passing years. So he seeks to measure the two main peoples, Greek and Persian, by each other. The Olympiad is not employed by Herodotus, but a kind of synchronism, which allows him to throw his occurrences into significant groups or cycles, thus giving him free range to set forth his ethical and dramatic view of things. Still these groups or

cycles he makes contemporaneous with one another, as he unfolds his two great Threads of History; as, in the present case, he gives us a cycle of the Persian tyrant, and then proceeds to give a cycle of the Greek tyrant, both being contemporaneous and connected in a certain spiritual kinship.

Of course such a chronology is vague according to modern notions, but it has its great advantages; it prevents an epoch from being cut up into years and brings the stress of attention upon the complete movements of history. Still it shows historical succession and contemporaneousness, the two time-factors of history; not by years, however, but by epochs and cycles.

Samos, an island of the Egean, is now the Greek center, which has passed from Miletus and the mainland, where it was in the Lydian time. The power has been concentrated in the hands of one man, Polycrates, who has dispossessed his brothers, put down the people and seized authority. Thus he differs from the Oriental despot, who has inherited his power and holds it in accord with the spirit of his people. But Polycrates has brought about his ascendancy through his own activity and ability, having wrenched it from others, and from the people who submit with more or less protest. He is, therefore, the strong individual, who has proved his own right, self-reliant, self-deter-

mined, self-made. So he is still Greek, in strong contrast with the Persian monarch, though he defies the Greek consciousness in establishing a tyranny.

The historian speaks of the long-continued good fortune of Polycrates, but it is manifest that the latter deserved his luck through his capacity. Notwithstanding, such a man is envied by the Gods, whose function it is to put the limit upon the individual in his prosperity and greatness. Polycrates too has his prophetic monitor, as Cyrus had in Croesus and as Croesus had in Solon. Now it is a friend, the Egyptian king Amasis, who sends the admonition, and bids him throw away that which he values most, "so that it may never more be seen of man." Polycrates accepts the advice and resolves to get rid of his most precious jewel, and thus forestall fate, like Oedipus and like Astyages. The ring (or seal) is thrown into the sea far from shore, but is brought back to its owner, after having been swallowed by a fish which is caught and carried to the king by a fisherman.

The historian again foreshadows the outcome of Polycrates through a Marvelous Tale, which shows that he cannot escape his own, it is certain to come back to him after many days. What is that of which he cannot get rid? It is his deed, that is really man's fate, though the story-teller does not say so, for such a statement would be

reflective, not mythical. The ocean, the universe will surely send him back his own; a faith of this kind rests on the moral order of the world. The fact is indeed a marvel, though very real; the Fairy Tale in its best form utters to the childlike mind this primordial belief. Possibly the ring, being circular, may also have its suggestion.

In the present conjuncture Samos is shown in a double conflict; with a party of its own citizens and with the Lacedemonians. It is manifest that Polycrates had a strong opposition among the Samians; these, when he tried to get rid of them, resisted, and called to their aid the Lacedemonians, who unsuccessfully sought to put down the tyrant. Polycrates, the fortunate man, is still master of the situation; but we see what a stir he roused against himself in Hellas. In the great conflict approaching, Greece cannot employ him; he is too like the Persian despot to be the bearer of the Hellenic principle. Nor can Samos be placed at the head of Greece, in spite of her power and greatness at this time; her people as a whole have shown themselves unable to shake off the yoke of their own tyrant; they have not the free Hellenic spirit, which is necessary to leadership. We may also note here that Sparta alone was not equal to suppressing the Samian tyrant; still less, could she alone have conquered the Persian. A new city is yet

to show the qualities which are now seen lacking both in Samos and Sparta. Athens will expel her own tyrant and then defeat the Persian; for her career events are preparing.

Polycrates seems to have sided more with the Orient than with Greece. He subjugated Greek islands and cities, but he was on friendly terms with Amasis; then he seems to have quit the Egyptian (Herodotus says the Egyptian quit him). At least we find him ready to help Cambyses when the latter attacked Egypt. It is highly probable that Polycrates saw which way the wind was blowing and shifted to suit the time. Certainly it was far more important for him to be on a good footing with Persia, whose territory lay nearest to his own, than with Egypt.

Polycrates, therefore, had broken deeply with Hellenism, Greece could not think of him as her protagonist against Asia. But he likewise stood in the way of Persia, which cannot accept a boundary to her power; he must in the end subordinate himself or fight. Still Polycrates had his historic function; he through his Thalassocracy kept the Persian power off the sea, till the fullness of time; he was a kind of wall behind which the infant Athens was protected and grew. He united the Greek islands in the only way they could be united, by the strong hand of despotic authority; thus the Egean did not at once fall under sway of the Persian.

Alongside of Polycrates, another bad tyrant of Greece is introduced in a sad story of domestic unhappiness. The Corinthians aid the Samian exiles, which fact gives the historian an opportunity to interweave the wicked deeds done by Periander and the retribution. He was tyrant of Corinth. He put to death his own wife, by whom he had two sons; one of these sons, he who had the superior talent, hearing of the murder of his mother, conceived the strongest loathing for his father, refused to live with him, even to see him. Yet the father still loved him, loved him with the greater intensity, and sent messenger after messenger to bring about a reconciliation; all in vain. The aged tyrant at last loses his son by death; thus the domestic tie, which he had so deeply wronged, avenges itself upon the violator. Again the tragic vein of our historian rises prominently into view; not a marvelous tale but a short novel we may name it; the incidents bear the impress of reality and are probably true in the main, though the author has given them an impressive dramatic coloring. History with Herodotus easily passes into biography, and biography rounds itself off into complete periods, or cycles of life. Such is one of Periander's cycles.

Samos in the time of Polycrates was not only a great political center, but also a great intellectual center, a precursor of Athens. Herodotus

praises the great works of the Samians in engineering and architecture — the tunnel through the mountain, the mole to protect the harbor, and the famous temple of Juno, “largest of all we have seen.” Samos indeed shows a tendency to Egyptian magnitude in its structures, an Oriental colossality. Then there were renowned artists in Samos, evidently forerunners of Greek sculpture. Polycrates must have had strong artistic taste; he selected as his most valued object the signet ring cut by Theodorus, a very famous Samian artist. In fact the Samians seem to have liked works of art a little too well; they are charged with stealing the bowl of Croesus and the corselet of Amasis (47). Anacreon, the jolly poet of Teios, was apparently a favorite of Polycrates. Nor must we forget the greatest of them all probably, Pythagoras the philosopher, who was born at Samos, and probably went thence to Egypt in the time of Polycrates and Amasis. On account of the trouble at Samos he emigrated to Italy, where his career became epoch-making in a number of ways. Egypt and Samos, through their mighty constructions, may both have contributed to his idea of making number the principle of all things. Pythagoras was indeed a great teacher, and his school he probably started in Samos, then the center of culture.

II.

We enter upon the second portion of Third Book with a return to the Persian Thread (61-159). There will be a repetition of the two Threads, Greek and Persian, thus the structure is like to that of the first portion just given. Yet there will be a kind of Persian appendix in reference to the revolt and recapture of Babylon (150).

In this portion the historian brings before us the fates of the two tyrants, Cambyzes and Polycrates, Persian and Greek, both perishing by a tragic death, both showing retribution for the deed, yet in different ways. Persia has internal conflict also, which she has to settle before she can march against Greece and the Occident. She has to make a transition to a new race of kings, to Darius, the organizer rather than the conqueror. The house of Cyrus has done its part in conquest, the new order must consolidate and build up the empire internally.

Still there are some conquests. Samos, the island of the Egean, the half-way station to continental Hellas, having lost its able tyrant, is shown to be incapable and unworthy of being the bearer of the Hellenic principle against the incoming Orient. Samos goes to pieces internally, no longer held by the strong hand, and easily falls a prey to the Persian.

1. *The second Persian Thread* (61-119). The general sweep of this part is the movement from the House of Cyrus, through revolution, to a new dynasty and a new order of things in Persia. The central figure, the pivotal character, is Darius who makes the transition from Persia the conqueror without, to Persia organized within. The chief stages of this change we shall follow out separately.

(1) The fate of Cambyses is told in the usual dramatic fashion. He had long been absent from Persia; he hears of the revolt of Smerdis the Magician. Cambyses had caused his own brother, also named Smerdis, to be secretly murdered; the result was that a pretender of the same name rose up and seized the government, passing himself off as Smerdis, the son of Cyrus. The tale of the usurpation of Smerdis has in it fictitious elements; the old dramatic device, resemblance of name and of person, is made the plot of the story (as in Shakespeare's *Comedy of Errors* and in the *Menoechmi* of Plautus, which last reaches up to a Greek model, which again may connect with the age of Herodotus). The false Smerdis has the same name as the murdered son of Cyrus and looks like him; hence the success of the impostor. But probably both kinds of resemblance are unhistorical; we know from the Behistun Inscription

that the real name of the usurper was Gomatas (or Gaumata); the personal resemblance was easily added. Still the Magian revolt is historical as well as the fact that the impostor pretended to be the son of Cyrus. Thus does our historian take the reality and clothe it in a fictitious garb.

Cambyzes at once sets out for Persia with bitter lamentings for his slain brother Smerdis, whom he now perceives to have been murdered in vain. Then, leaping on his horse, he was wounded by his own sword in the thigh, "just where he had formerly stabbed the Egyptian God Apis." So retribution has come; the dream is fulfilled, which he tried to forestall in the case of Smerdis; and the prophecy concerning his death is about to be verified. With deep remorse he confesses his guilt, and announces that the Median Magi, "he whom I left steward of my palace and his brother Smerdis," now rule the land of Cyrus. He conjures the Persians present to recover the crown from the Medes, wherein we may see that there was still some jealousy between the Persians and the Medes, and that the present revolution had its political side.

(2) This revolt or usurpation of the Magi has given rise to a good deal of conjecture. From two or three allusions we may infer that Herodotus regarded it as a political revolution; the Medes revolt and regain for a few months their

ancient ascendancy. This view is held by influential modern historians (Grote and Niebuhr). Unquestionably there is some truth in the view. The House of Cyrus in the person of its monarch Cambyses had quit Persia and had stayed in Egypt; why should not discontent arise? Then after Cambyses there was no heir of the House of Cyrus; why should not the authority revert to the Medes? The ruler being absent, the Empire in Asia would have a tendency to dissolve of itself. Hence the call for the organizer, Darius.

Yet there is no doubt that a religious principle plays in also, as is always the case in the political revolutions of the Orient. The Magians were worshipers of the elements — fire, air, water, sun, moon; this worship had assailed and probably in part had supplanted the old Persian Dualism, Light and Darkness, or good and evil, Ormuzd and Ahriman (see Rawlinson's Essay, appended to his Translation of Herodotus, Book II.). The conquered population of Media and Persia adhered to their old religion, which was not that of their Aryan conquerors. This old, partially repressed religion again flames up and seeks supremacy, not only religious but also political, in the Magian revolt.

To this we may add that there was also something of a social upheaval in the affair. The Magi were priests, in the possession of a sacred ritual; they were a caste. On the other hand,

the Persians were soldiers, at least the chief soldiers, and they had the State. Thus the conflict so often seen in History, arises in Persia, the conflict between the military and the sacerdotal class. A priest-king gets the crown; at once he exempts everybody from military service and from tribute, doubtless a very popular measure to all except the Persians, who were the military captains and were exempt from tribute at all times. But the State went to pieces by such a policy; see the many revolts which Darius had to put down mentioned in the Behistun Inscription (Rawlinson Herodotus, Vol. II., Appendix). Such a political result may have been intended by the Magus, as it would destroy the Persian supremacy.

Such various gleams — political, religious, social — flash out of this revolution from afar, with much intermittent darkness. The student will note that the same conflict between the two castes, priest and soldier, took place in Egypt also (see the preceding Book), and with the same result, namely, the dissolution of the State under a priest-king. But Persia at once recovered herself, while Egypt remained long in a condition of internal disruption.

(3) The story of the discovery of the imposture and the death of the Magi is given with fullness and vigor by the historian (67-78). A noble Persian Otanes finds out the truth through

his daughter, who is one of the wives of the king; five associates join with him, when Darius, son of Hystaspes, arrives in Susa from Persia, and is taken into the conspiracy. Darius also had found out the imposture, and Prexaspes, who had slain the true Smerdis, announces the fact openly to the people and puts an end to his own life on the spot. It is curious that Darius, who had to tell a falsehood to the guard in order to gain entrance to the king, gives a sophistical defense of lying (72), which in a good Persian seems contradictory, as a chief point in their education was to speak the truth. But he seems to justify himself "by the advantage to be gained," and so he serves up deception to the deceiver.

As there is now no ruler and no established authority of any kind, the question comes up, what form of government shall we choose? At least such a question comes up in the mind of Herodotus, who all his life must have been hearing discussions about the best method of constructing a State. Those active Greek heads had already opened the problem, which is still worked over and over with many a twist and turn: Shall it be a monarchy, an aristocracy, or a democracy? Hardly does any such question belong to the Orient, but here it is interjected into the stream of events, and we may well listen to the argument.

Otanes favors a democracy: "How can a monarchy be a well-constituted government, where one man is allowed to do what he pleases *without responsibility?*" Very distinctly does the speaker point out the psychological effects of absolute authority upon the one who exercises it: "If the best man were granted such power, he would depart from his wonted thoughts, insolence would be engendered in him." Behold the career of Cambyses. Envy too will rise in the breast of the monarch. "He changes the country's institutions, violates women, and puts men to death without trial." A summary of the Greek tyrant! "Democracy, on the contrary, has isonomy (equality before the law), most beautiful word! The ruling power is selected by lot and is responsible, while all plans are referred to the public."

From these and other expressions in the course of his History, as well as from certain events of his life, Herodotus is usually considered as favoring democracy. Still he puts a plea for aristocracy (the rule of the best) into the mouth of Megabyzus, who repeats the Greek common-places about the folly and tyranny of the multitude; "nothing is more senseless and insolent than the worthless rabble (*canaille*, *bummers*)," better the single-headed tyrant than the many-headed one. Thus the everlasting conflict between Demos and Aristos, with boundless

mutual vituperation, has started on its career down time.

Darius now takes up the argument in favor of monarchy, after setting forth the evils inherent in the other two forms of government. Moreover did not we Persians get our freedom from Cyrus, a monarch? "My opinion is that we should maintain the same kind of government and not change the institutions of the fathers." Darius has the best of the argument for his Oriental audience, the three silent conspirators side with him, and a monarchy is decreed. But who is to be the monarch? It comes to the man who has defended monarchy. Darius in his speech puts special stress upon the monarch's being a good man; on the whole, he fulfills the requirements which he himself lays down.

We may well think that this whole discussion is a piece taken out of our historian's life at Athens. The partisans of Aristos and Demos were abundant in that city, though Demos had the upper hand; it is possible that even Tyrannos (some belated follower of Pisistratus) may have had his defenders. It is supposed that Herodotus came into personal contact with Pericles, the grand champion of democracy; we may have here some short abstract of a speech or a conversation of the Athenian statesman. Certain it is that Demos makes the best plea of the three in this Persian disputation, which is, how-

ever, simply a bit of Greek speculation on the nature of government. The historian naively declares at the start that some Greeks think such a discussion never took place in Persia.

(3) Darius shows himself the right man in the right place at the right time: he becomes the organizer of the Persian Empire, now falling to pieces. It is true that he is represented as getting the crown through the sagacity of his groom, but he probably obtained it through merit, and took it himself by his own power. The historian is fond of tracing the external accident which accompanies the inner and necessary movement of events. Some have supposed, too, that Darius was the rightful heir after the extinction of the house of Cyrus; the Behistun Inscription seems to make some such claim. At any rate he begins by showing his insight into the needs of his time and of his country, as well as his administrative talent. He divides the Empire into twenty nomes or satrapies; then he imposes on each a fixed tax, which is certainly an enormous stride forward in administration. The historian says: "During the reign of Cyrus and Cambyses there was no stipulated tribute, but only presents." The regulation was probably unpopular with the ruling Persians, for it lessened their opportunity for rapacity and plunder. "Hence the Persians call Darius a tradesman," an opprobrious term in their eyes.

It has been often noticed that the Turkish and Persian governments of to-day are very similar to the ancient Persian. Indeed some writers affirm that the ancient Persian Empire was better administered than are Turkey and Persia at present. Less cruelty, less fanaticism, less corruption and rapacity; more enlightenment, more civilization; so we may give credit to Darius as a great reformer in political and probably in religious matters. In the Behistun Inscription he declares that he had restored the faith of Ormuzd, which the Magian rule had set aside.

(4) The historian, having given an account of the organization of the Persian Empire by Darius, passes to its extreme limits toward the East, where it had subjected India, which Herodotus unquestionably places in the valley of the Indus, not in the valley of the Ganges. Of the conquest of these Eastern lands by Persia we know nothing, though it is evident that there must have been great wars of subjugation in those regions. But such events are not historical, have never been taken up into the historic movement of the race; Persia herself gets a place in History almost wholly through her great conflict with the West and its representative, Hellas. The struggle of Persia with India, Bactria, Sogdiana and the rest was outside the pale of the historic consciousness.

Our historian, as soon as he begins to treat of these remote parts, becomes mythical in his narrative; India is now the land of wonders (98). He drops into the Marvelous Tale in order to account for the vast quantity of Indian gold; hence the story of the huge ants which dig up the sands of the desert and thus bring to the surface the shining metal, which is carried off at the risk of human life. Such is the toiling miner here, who throws out the treasures of the earth without knowing their value, and is robbed of them by the stranger. It has been often conjectured that stories of this sort are fabricated in order to scare away explorers.

In like manner Arabia to the South furnishes a borderland of Arabian Tales for our historian, similar to those of the Thousand Nights (107). On this rim of the world grow those marvelous aromatic articles which lend such a perfume to Araby the Blest. Frankincense is guarded by winged serpents, which have to be driven off by burning styrax, whose offensive odor conquers these fragrance-loving reptiles. The cassia has to be fought for against "winged animals like bats, which screech terribly and are very fierce." Cinnamon is obtained from the nests of large birds, which are built at inaccessible places on high mountains, and which are broken down by huge pieces of meat carried up thither by these birds (compare the fabulous *roc* in the story of

Sinbad). Mythical animals and fowls, often with commingled shapes, are characteristic of the art and the legend of the Orient.

The historian (106) gives us a glimpse of his philosophy in this matter. "The extreme parts of the earth possess the most excellent products" — that is, the most extraordinary; India, "the farthest region of the inhabited world toward the east," has the largest birds and quadrupeds, as well as the most gold. Arabia, "the farthest of all inhabited countries toward the south" has its wonderful aromatic plants. From these wonders of nature the mind easily sweeps to the wonders of fable; so the extremes of the earth with their extraordinary products become Fableland. Extraordinary they are for Greece with its moderate climate, its central situation, its even-tempered people whose chief proverb is, *No excess*. As our historian moves out in Space from his Hellenic center toward the Oriental border, he gets mythical; in like manner, as he moves upward in Time, he shows a similar tendency. The present belongs to the Understanding and is historical; the distant belongs to the Imagination and grows more and more toward the fabulous:

Already we have noted a similar fringe of fable to the South of Egypt, the African border, in the first Persian Thread; now in this second Persian Thread we have the Asiatic border of

fable, hinting the symmetrical structure of the present Book.

Thus the history of Persia fades into a mythical twilight, as the historian moves out toward its limits. Already the account of Persia is mingled with fictitious elements, though they clothe real history. Not the least interesting study is the consciousness of the historian, as he unfolds his great work; he becomes mythical in his treatment where man is mythical; for the chief historic fact of an epoch and of a nation may be just the fact that they are mythical, or in the mythical stage.

2. *The second Greek Thread* (120). In the preceding Thread we see Persia rising to a new life and order through Darius; in the present Thread we witness a Greek State sinking into disorder and ruin, and finally absorbed into the Persian Empire. Samos is a tyranny, which cannot take an independent position permanently between the Orient and the Occident; when the strong tyrant is destroyed, the people show themselves incapable of continuing either a free or a tyrannical government.

(1) The fate of the Greek tyrant Polycrates is told first, in correspondence with the fate of the Persian tyrant Cambyses of the preceding Thread.

A Persian satrap of Asia Minor, Oroetes by name, evidently sees the necessity of getting rid

of Polycrates, and so lures him to destruction by a tempting bait — heaps of money. Moreover, he throws the Greek tyrant off his guard by a specious pretext, saying that “King Cambyzes meditates my death.” Plainly does Polycrates here lose his sagacity, he perishes through the plot of Oroetes by a most terrible kind of death, which the historian refuses to describe. Moreover he is entrapped into an unfriendly act against Persia, offering to take the treasures which really belonged to the Persian monarch, if Oroetes had been telling the truth. The forecast of Amasis regarding Polycrates has come true.

Note the various causes assigned by the historian for the slaying of the Greek tyrant by Oroetes: first the taunt from another Persian satrap — purely fortuitous; secondly a personal cause — the insult to the satrap’s herald on the part of Polycrates; thirdly, the political cause — the tyrant’s ambition to rule the Greek islands and Ionia (122) and thus put a limit on the Persian supremacy. To these causes, we may add the fourth, the world-historical, not directly mentioned by Herodotus: the Samian power could not be the bearer of either Hellenism or Orientalism in the approaching struggle, and had, in the order of things, to be swept out of the way.

We may observe, in passing, the clear distinc-

tion which the historian makes (122) between the historical and the mythical: Polycrates is the first Greek who formed the plan of a Thalassocracy (rule of the sea), except Minos or any others before his time (who belong to the heroic or mythical age); but in the so-called human (non-heroic or historical) age Polycrates is the first. Such is the important distinction here made by the historian himself, which he speaks of as current in his time, probably at Athens.

After the Samian Thalassocracy comes the Athenian, which Herodotus saw before him when writing this passage, and compared it with that of Polycrates, who had the idea which Athens carried out after the Persian War. It must be remembered that Herodotus passed some time at Samos, where he had the opportunity of studying Samian history from native sources, and of finding its true place in the development of Greek history. Also he made a prolonged stay at Athens. Thus he seeks to order the totality of Greek history, giving every section its due, quite as Homer gives a totality of the Greek world in describing the Trojan conflict.

It is to be noted that Thucydides and Aristotle, both later than Herodotus and both quite devoid of his legendary sympathies, allude to the Thalassocracy of Minos as historical (Thuc. I. 4, and Arist. Pol. II. 10. See *Rawlinson*, also

Stein, ad loc.). Thus we find our historian dropping hints here and there, which show that he was to a certain extent conscious of his own procedure, or growing into a consciousness thereof in the writing of his Book. This distinction between mythical and historical is fundamental in his spiritual texture, and he was aware of it in part.

This Oroetes is not a very good Persian in one way; he is a cunning liar, deceiving Polycrates, himself no novice in craft, both with words and actions. Thus he is learning Greek subtlety and bringing it home to its chief practitioners. But Oroetes himself, becoming insolent with successful treachery and murder, gets the backstroke of his own deeds, and perishes through a plot laid for him by Darius, who also can employ deception, as we have already seen. Thus the Persian tyrant gets his own also; this even-handed justice is not confined to the Greek, being indeed a principle of the world-order.

Still Oroetes with his crimes has his place in the grand historic movement of the age. He brings about the death of Polycrates, which takes away the main barrier of the Persian to crossing the sea into continental Greece. The Samian Thalassocracy is destroyed, the Egean becomes a Persian sea, still traversed by Greek sailors, though no longer independent. The Persian, however, was never fully able to master the

watery element; though ruler, he was still dependent on the Greek mariner. The new Thalassocracy, the democratic one, that of Athens, will rise and sweep him from the sea. But this is a chapter of Greek history, whose full development lies beyond the ken of our historian.

(2) Now we have another kind of story interwoven into the narrative, forming a contrast with the tale of the tyrants, and showing the new realm in which the Greek triumphs over the Barbarian. Greek science is also to be celebrated in the pages of history; Greek intellect will finally be the conqueror in this conflict, Pallas Athena and her city will overwhelm the Persian, who tries to seize both by violence, from the outside.

Democedes (120) was born in Crotona, a Greek city of Italy, famous for its medical school. He had been a kind of public practitioner in several Greek States — Egina, Athens, Samos — by which fact we see that the Greek cities had already some sort of sanitary regulation, and regarded health as a public matter. Instruments, too, he had; the free Greek life of the time is manifestly flowering into science.

But Democedes ventures into Asia in company with Polycrates; he soon finds himself a slave, and is sent up to Susa, the Persian capital, along with other slaves. There, however, his medical skill quickly brings him into

notice, he cures the king's sprain by means of "his Greek remedies," the Egyptian doctors being completely outdone and discredited. It is a noteworthy fact that he intercedes to save his medical rivals from the effects of the king's displeasure, and does rescue them; a truly humane trait, also a result of the free Greek life, which recognizes the competitor and will not destroy him. Still Democedes, though honor, wealth, and royal favors are showered upon him, is unhappy, is a bird in a cage; he longs to return to Greece where alone he finds life worth living. He is not free at the court of Darius, so he plans his escape.

Here a personal element plays in to help him out: Queen Atossa is cured by him of a dangerous malady and gives him a promise to send him to Greece. She is another Persian beguiler, now a woman beguiling her husband. But under this personal reason we can observe the political reason: Greece has become the grand limit of the Persian Empire; we may go further and say the grand limit of Persian consciousness, which limit must somehow be removed if Persia is to exist. Thus Atossa's words only persuade Darius to do that which he was ready to do, and to which Persian spirit was pressing him forward. So an exploring expedition is sent out to Greece with Democedes, in order to take notes of the country and report to Darius the situation,

“Fifteen eminent Persians” went with him, who were “to see that he did not escape;” so he was suspected a little after all.

When the Greek doctor is as far away as possible from Persian authority, in distant Italy, he succeeds in escaping to his own home, Crotona, whither the Persians pursue him and try to capture him in the market place as a runaway slave; but it goes against the grain of a free community to give up such a fugitive. After a struggle the pursuers leave without Democedes, who sends back to the king a piece of Greek bravado. Says the historian, “These were the first Persians who came from Asia to Greece, and these came as spies,” spying out the future problem of Persia; Democedes was hardly the cause of the embassy’s being sent, rather the embassy was the cause of his being sent to Greece.

It is a typical story of the time, showing how science had begun to germinate in that free Greek life, with an excellence not to be found in Asia, or even in Egypt noted for its physicians from the old ages; showing how the Asiatic monarch wished to possess this excellence for himself, and so tried to seize it from without and reduce it to servitude; how the captive Greek longs to escape and to return to his own free world. In like fashion a Persian monarch later on will try to seize all Hellas at once from the

outside, thinking perchance he can possess its superiority in that way; but he will be foiled, as Darius is foiled in keeping Doctor Democedes in slavery, though the chains be golden.

(3) Having heard the story of Democedes, we return to the history of Samos (139) after the death of Polycrates. It is not the intention of the Persian to surrender the advantage gained, he must take possession of Samos, "the first city of Greece" at that time, and the capital of the Thalassocracy, which blocked the passage to Europe. The plan is to establish a Greek tyrant, brother of Polycrates, over the city, yet have him subject to Persian authority. Here again a personal ground is given to account for the selection of the man whose name is Syloson: he, on a visit to Egypt in the reign of Cambyses, had done a favor to Darius, then a member of the body-guard of the Persian monarch, "and a person of no great account;" thus he became a benefactor of Darius, who gave him back his favor in the shape of the government of Samos.

The Samians, however, show themselves divided upon the great question of the time: Shall we accept the Persian and the tyrant, or turn toward democracy and freedom? Maeandrius, the chief man left in charge after the death of Polycrates, favors the latter; "what I condemn in another, I shall not

do myself, namely, exercise despotic sway over others equal to myself. I, therefore, lay down my authority and proclaim *isonomy* for all." But just at this point the Greek demagogue appears with his scurrility, and even Maeandrius gives up his lofty hopes of *isonomy*: "for he saw that if he should lay down his power, some other fellow would be set up as tyrant in his place." He perceiving the situation proposes to surrender to the Persians without a blow, and quit the country, but an unexpected opposition rises through his brother Charilaus, "a half-witted person." Syloson however gets possession of Samos and the Persian influence becomes paramount. Maeandrius goes to Sparta, then deemed the head of the opposition to Persia, but he is rudely expelled under the pretext of bribery. But how could he, who had been both a democrat and a tyrant, be acceptable to aristocratic Sparta?

Thus Samos with its Thalassocracy is swallowed up, and the sea no longer stands in the way of the Persian advance to the mainland of Europe. Samos could not be the bearer of the Hellenic principle, that is plain; so it is swept out in the great overshadowing movement toward the culminating struggle. But Darius and Persia are held back from Greece for the present by an internal trouble; this is the revolt of Babylon, which is appended here to the present Book.

3. The third Persian Thread (150-160).

“While the naval armament was moving against Samos, Babylon revolted, having prepared itself well;” this great city in the heart of the Persian Empire, had to be retaken first of all. The hero is Zopyrus, who shows his devotion to his king and country by maiming himself and pretending to desert to the enemy, over whom he is placed in command on account of his zeal and bravery, then at the critical moment he betrays the city. This is a well-known Eastern Tale of which many forms have been current throughout the Orient. It reappears in Greek and Roman writers (for instance, Polyænus and Livy), and may thus be regarded as a kind of universal folk-tale, which shows the loyalty of the individual to his land and ruler in a peculiar way involving self-mutilation, deep-laid cunning, courage, with final success and reward. The historic fact is the revolt and recapture of Babylon; the fiction plays in with the hero performing the deed.

In the Behistun Inscription, which mentions two revolts of Babylon under Darius, the name and deed of Zopyrus are not mentioned; the naked fact of rebellion and conquest is stated in the most naked fashion. Great is the contrast with Herodotus, who clothes the historical with the heroic and mythical.

OBSERVATIONS ON THE THIRD BOOK.

1. The reader will notice quite a difference in style and in manner of treatment between the Greek and Oriental Threads on the part of the historian; this difference corresponds with and mirrors the different character of the two sections. Herodotus falls into the tone of the Arabian Tales when he describes the wonders of Arabia and of the extreme East; he lays aside his critical acumen, and makes little or no separation between history and fable. He seems to share in both easily, and can become historian or fabulist according to the need of the place and the time. When he speaks of the gold of India dug up by colossal ants, and the frankincense of Arabia guarded by winged serpents, he lapses into the Oriental view and belief. The political accounts of the East, those pertaining to Cambyzes, Smerdis, Darius, are history mingled with fiction, though Greek conceptions, such as nemesis, the return of the deed to the doer,

wind through them, and gives them a peculiar artistic coloring. Remarkable is this sympathy of the old historian, not found in any other, ancient or modern; his soul is transmuted into that of the people whom he describes, he adjusts himself to their consciousness and thus interprets them. Asia has even in its reality this marvelous element, at least to the Occidental mind; if reduced to the prose of the historic consciousness, its essence is lost.

The center of this world's periphery is Hellas, the land not of extremes, but the mean, whose principle is moderation, proportion, harmony. When the historian touches the Greeks, he partakes of their character; he is historical, he finds and describes the reality; he feels himself among a people with a consciousness of history. The Greek myth he often rationalizes, often rejects, yet sometimes accepts; even in Greece he interweaves a mythical strand into affairs; how else could he mirror Greek spirit? But the Orient turns to fableland in proportion as he gets from the center; indeed to the Oriental himself the world is a kind of a fabulous thing. Herodotus reflects this consciousness, yet in Greek fashion; he is partly Oriental by birth, residence, travel and culture, and still a Greek. He has both sides in a delightful harmony, he is not the extremist in one direction or the other. If he were strictly historical or strictly

mythical, he could never have done his work, he could never have been the Father of History. A dual nature he has, which not only enables him to portray the great conflict with sympathy, but makes him an image of it within himself.

But when our historian comes to the West, all changes and he changes with all. It seems a different world not only as to territory but as to spirit; it seems to call up in him a new canon of judgment. He will not believe in the Cassiterides, or Tin Islands of the Far West, though they existed and exported tin which he saw; he will not believe in the river Eridanus of the Far Northwest, whence amber is said to come; yet what improbability in a river discharging itself into the Northern Sea? No miracle in that, still he questions it, though he can believe in the Indian ants and in the winged serpents of Arabia. "The extremities of Asia and Libya" he decorates with a fringe of fable, but he utterly refuses any such decoration to "the extremities of Europe" (115). He also refuses credence to the one-eyed Arimaspians of the North.

Important is the following sentence (116) for the standpoint of the historian in this matter: "The extremities of the world, surrounding the rest of the earth and inclosing it within, seem to possess those things which are the rarest and are deemed the most beautiful." The conception of the world's rim, and its periphery of

wonders here comes to the surface and finds expression. Still the western part of this periphery is not adorned with the legend which we find elsewhere — East, South, and even in the North (see the following Book).

2. Herodotus must, in one way or other, have spent a good deal of time in Samos and with Samians. In this third Book he assigns to them a chief part, and puts them alongside of Persia. In the great struggle between Orient and Occident he distinctly sees and establishes their historic position, which is the most important one in the Hellas of that period. Moreover he shows an intimate knowledge, not only of political events, but also of many personal matters pertaining to the island. In the rest of his work he often introduces something about Samos, there is something of a Samian strain running through the whole of it.

A late Greek writer, Suidas, states that Herodotus had to flee from Halicarnassus on account of the tyrant Lygdamis, grandson of Queen Artemisia, who has attained such distinction for all time through our historian. The same writer relates that Herodotus at Samos chose the Ionic dialect for his history and wrote the latter there — both somewhat doubtful statements, at least needing modification. But another statement of Suidas may be in general accepted: the historian returned to his native city and aided in expelling

the tyrant. This event may be placed (*Stein, Einleitung*, s. 10) in the year 449 B. C., when an Athenian fleet under Cimon appeared along the southwestern coast of Asia Minor.

At that time Herodotus was about thirty-five years old (born 484 B. C.), and had doubtless completed his travels in the Orient, or the greater part of them. But how long he stayed at Samos before he returned to Halicarnassus, cannot be told. The probability is, that he had been often at Samos before and had connections there; he must have read the native chroniclers, for there was literary activity already at the court of Polycrates, and historic composition had been practiced in Ionia, especially at Miletus; he must also have heard many traditions of the golden age of Samos, not a hundred years distant in time; many experiences he gathered concerning the Persian war from men still living who had passed through them. We can imagine him conversing all his life with Samians whom he knew, and who had information to impart, jotting down his facts, and gradually bringing them into the order in which we see them.

The account of the Samians coming to the Greek fleet at Delos and begging for support in a revolt against the Persians may well have been taken down from the lips of one of the chief actors (IX. 90). The conduct of the Samians who were in the Persian camp at the battle of

Mycale and who had been deprived of their arms through a suspicion of their fidelity (IX. 103), is probably the report of one who was there to the inquiring historian (see also IX. 106, for another important incident at Samos during this same time). Thus the Samians seem to be specially mentioned, while the other islanders are on the whole lumped together. The two Samian captains who took Greek ships at the battle of Salamis and distinguished themselves by zeal for the Persian cause, are mentioned by name (VIII. 85) and thus branded with disgrace — doubtless the whole being an echo from Samos. The bravery of the Samians in the battle fought in Cyprus (V. 112) is duly recorded; their bad behavior during the Ionic revolt is not omitted (VI. 13, 14.).

It is not necessary to hold that Herodotus must have lived several years at Samos in order to get this information, though he doubtless had stayed there off and on a good deal. He knows the offerings in the great temple of Juno at Samos, and knows their history; matters pertaining to Samian trade and wealth he is acquainted with; gossip about persons is not excluded (IV. 43). In this Third Book there is a Samian atmosphere, which the sympathy our historian has reproduced so well, just as there is an Egyptian atmosphere in the Second Book.

BOOK FOURTH.

The main connecting principle between this and the preceding Book lies in the fact that the Persian is driving with all his might against the Rim of Barbarians which surrounds his empire. He must remove that external limit to his rule or dash himself to pieces against it. Already we have seen in Book Second how that Cambyzes, after conquering Egypt, pushed out against the Ethiopians to the South and against the Ammonians to the East of his Egyptian boundary. In Book First we beheld Cyrus, the founder of the Persian empire, perish in his attack on the Massagetae to the North of Persia. Further to the East, we catch some vague hints of the Persian impinging upon India, and possibly Thibet, but these countries lie beyond the

knowledge of Herodotus. Thus we see Persia on all sides chafing against her physical limits, shaking the adamantine chains of nature, but unable to break through them.

It is manifest that the Persians are a great will-people, conquerors like the Romans, restless in any physical bounds yet unable to transcend them. Herein they contrast strongly with both Greek and Egyptian. The Greek was content with a small city, but he sought for autonomy in its walls; the outer bound did not concern him so much, but his endeavor was to remove the inner bound to his spirit; not the physical but the spiritual limit he chafed against, and so he opens the battle for freedom just with this Persian Empire.

On the other hand the Egyptians were in the main an introverted, self-occupied people there in the narrow valley of the Nile; self-satisfied they seem, having no deep inner struggle like the Greek, and no mighty outer struggle like the Persian, with their limits. Both these Oriental peoples flow into Greece and are taken up by its spirit, as they are here taken up into the history of Herodotus — whereby they, Persia and Egypt, become historical, yea world-historical. In themselves, however, they show no such power.

We have already mentioned the Rim of Barbarism, which, in the present Book, reaches the height of its importance, though it encompasses,

as it were, the whole history of Herodotus. In general, Greece and the Persian Empire lay inside of this Rim, which encircled ancient civilization, and gave to the same a most pressing question, which may be stated as follows: What are we going to do with the vast mass of uncivilized peoples dwelling around us on every side? The answer always felt if not spoken, is: if we do not put them down, they will put us down.

These barbarous peoples often broke through the bound and fell upon civilized countries; note the Cimmerians and the Scythians mentioned in the First Book. The reader can still feel in ancient writers that these barbarians were a dark cloud in the horizon, uncertain, premonitory and menacing; a fate, the real fate of Persia, Greece and Rome. It is well known the ancient world perished through the peoples coming from that border and from behind it. The ancient world was tragic in reality, and the fate so often portrayed in its Tragedy is its true forecast, the very fact of it.

We may here be permitted to take a glance at the various dealings with this barbarous Rim. Persia sought to subjugate it externally; Greece sought to colonize it and to impart to it Greek culture; Rome conquered it in part, civilized this part, and gave to it law and order and military discipline, and then was destroyed by it. Chris-

tianity went beyond it and gave to its peoples religion, humanized them, and so conquered Fate, which hung over the old world. Christianity first broke down the barbarous Rim and made all brothers, so that there cannot again be a destruction of civilization from without. Greece began the work by her colonies, Rome possessed that outside power across the Rim externally; Christianity obtained it internally. Modern Europe and even present America has no such Rim of Barbarism, or of the civilized versus the uncivilized.

So we conceive of that barbaric border as it lay in the mind of Herodotus. Persia grapples with it on every side, but is thrown back from it; Persia could conquer only through an order in the nation conquered, but the barbarian pure and simple has nothing to seize, no fields, no cities, chiefly no State, or social order. Persia can subject only civilized Asia with Egypt, all of which is now consolidated under her control.

But inside the border, where lies the civilized world, there is the grand split; Europe and Asia, or Greece and Persia, are the two parts, which cannot be made one. The Greek resists Persian unity, in favor of what he calls freedom; the matter can be settled only by a struggle which is now everywhere approaching. So there is the barbarous limit to Persia on the one hand, and the Greek limit to her power on the other.

The Fourth Book gives two phases of the Persian impinging against this Rim or the barbarous limit of the world — namely the Northern and the Southern (rather Southeastern), or the Scythian and the Libyan. They are thus opposite, from Greece as a center — counterparts, the hot and the cold regions. We may observe a kind of symmetry in the two portions, which Herodotus shows by his statement that there must be Hypernotians if there be Hyperboreans.

Another fact: each of these borders, Scythian and Libyan, has a line of Greek towns, colonies sent out by the mother country, for trade and for relief of her population. The Greek did not seek, on the whole, to conquer these barbarians; he sought his personal advantages there, went there to live, and bore thither his Greek culture, which he began to impart to his barbaric neighbors. The Persian did not colonize, little of that spirit is seen in the Orient excepting in Phoenicia. Greece appears to have begotten the idea of colonization and to have introduced it as an important factor in the World's History. It seems to require a free people to make good colonists — not the migratory hordes of the East. The colonist must have an individual strength of his own in the new land to build his home and to preserve his civilization. Each settlement was a center of light; so Greece palisaded all Barbary with lines of colonies.

Yet these towns were absorbed by Persia or ran the danger thereof. Such had been already the fate of the studded line of thriving communities along the coast of Asia Minor; many Greek towns had been compelled to yield to Persia. So also in the North in Thrace. In Libya likewise Cyrene and Barce at one time or other had to yield their independent life to the same power.

Yet another limit of the world was faintly dawning — the geographical; beyond the barbaric Belt lay, it was supposed, vast seas, indeed the Ocean Stream surrounding the earth. Africa had been circumnavigated, Europe was rumored to have a Northern Sea as the limit on the North; to the West outside the Pillars of Hercules lay also a great sea. The century before Herodotus was a time of geographical investigation, pushing over the limits without and within. The classic Renaissance showed a similar activity in the geographical field, Africa had to be again circumnavigated. Thus Greece, the center, seeks to reach the circumference by knowledge, by enterprise, even by colonization.

On the other hand, the heroes, born in Barbary, but who saw the advantages of Greek culture and sought to bring it to the people, are not forgotten. They met with a tragic fate, as such men usually do; still the barbarian became tinged with Greek civilization. Note the names

of Anacharsis the Scythian and King Scylas ; also of Zamolxis the Thracian. So among barbarians the new idea had its martyrs.

The structure of the Book, in accord with its theme, falls into two portions: 1st., Scythia and the attack by the Persian upon the same (1-144) ; 2d., Libya with its Greek colonies, and the attack by the Persian (145-205). The attack on Scythia is the main one, being led by the Persian king, Darius ; the attack on Libya is of less account, being the work of the Satrap of Egypt. Both are essentially without results ; or at least no permanent conquest is effected ; the barbaric Rim asserts itself against the vast might of Persia in both cases.

Such are the two main divisions of the Book ; but each of these main divisions has leading subdivisions dealing specially with Barbarians, Persians, and Greeks. The whole shows a symmetrical order and movement, of which we may take a complete survey in the following tabular statement :—

I. The Scythian division (1-144).

1. The Barbarico-Scythian Thread—account of the Scythian barbarians (1-82).
2. The Persico-Scythian Thread — expedition of Darius against Scythia (83-144).

II. The Libyan division (145-205).

1. Greco-Libyan Thread, giving an account of Greek colonies in Libya (145-167).
2. Barbarico-Libyan Thread, giving an account of the Libyan barbarians (168-199).
3. Persico-Libyan Thread, giving an account of the Persian invasion of Libya (200-205).

The symmetrical structure of the two divisions would be complete if the historian had given a separate account of the Greek settlements in Scythia; but of these he tells incidentally.

I.

We shall, accordingly, first consider the Scythian division of the Book, which, after a short allusion to the desire of Darius "to punish the Scythians," will proceed to give an elaborate account of Scythia and its peoples, and then will take up the grand expedition of the Persian monarch against that country. We shall call the entire northern tract, corresponding nearly to modern European Russia, by the name of Scythia, though a distinction is to be made between the Scythians proper and other peoples dwelling there; just as the Russia of to-day embraces not only Russians as such, but many

other distinct peoples and even races. Both these meanings of the term may be found in Herodotus.

1. *The Barbarico-Scythian Thread.* This embraces the account of the Scythians as a mass of barbarous tribes (1-82), which had long before Herodotus begun to excite the attention of Greek colonists, navigators, and merchants. A good deal of information was extant about Scythia ere the historian wrote, but he traveled thither himself, in the true spirit of the investigator. Here is the result which still has its importance for ethnography and anthropology, as well as for geography and history.

(1) The book opens with what may be called a short Introduction (1-4), in which there is, first of all, the mention of the leading theme — the great expedition of Darius. When Babylon had been taken (see end of preceding Book), and the troubles of the new monarch, resulting from a change of dynasty, had been quieted, Darius resolved on making his expedition against the Scythians. Why not against Greece? Why such a turn given to Persian desire for conquest? The motive assigned by Herodotus was that of punishing the Scythians for their invasion of Media, when they are said to have ruled over Upper Asia for the period of twenty-eight years (Book I. 103-6).

A very insufficient reason this seems; in the

first place Darius could hardly feel himself called on to avenge an insult to Media when he had just suppressed a Median usurper and an essentially Median revolt. Then the insult had taken place about one hundred years before this time.

Therefore we must at least add to the reason given by Herodotus. That the Scythian tract could send forth a wild, fierce, barbarous mass upon civilization had often been experienced (Cimmerians and Scythians). Indeed the great race war between Iran and Turan was something of this sort. Possibly a new invasion threatened, so that the Persian very naturally renews the old war with Turan, with the North, and seeks to control this mass in its own home, before its departure.

But, whatever be the cause, the war was a happy event for Greece. After the taking of Samos, the last Greek barrier was broken down; still the blow of the Persian fell to the North, into the water, as it were, and the continental Greeks obtained valuable time for preparation.

Note that on the return of these invading Scyths to their homes, after an absence of twenty-eight years, a story is interwoven, common the world over, and pertaining to a soldier absent for a long time. What will his wife do? A new generation springs up, with which there is a contest.

The reader is next to enter upon a long treat-

tise which shows the interest of the historian in the Scythian country. A right instinct lies at the bottom of this extended account; Herodotus must have felt a new world reposing there in germ. Modern Europe was at that time faintly sprouting; the people who were to be the future actors in the World's History were struggling, seething in that vast region. The Aryan race in three leading stocks was doubtless there, the Teuton (Getae) the Slavonian (Sarmatae), even the Celt (Cimmerian, Geloni) in some scattered remains. Also Turanian elements were present both fore and aft; the Finn and the Lapp, and doubtless others, were being pushed into corners and byways, while the Tartar was pressing behind the Aryan races. A mighty cauldron of peoples, big with futurity, is this Scythia; our historian now has his face turned to what is to be, as in Egypt it was turned toward what has been, Greece being the present.

(2) The first question is: “What is the origin of the Scyths? How did they get to be?” No less than four accounts are given (5-15) one of which is historical and three mythical.

The first is the mythical account given by the Scythians themselves, which starts with the first man, the Adam of Scythia, called Targitaus, son of Zeus and a daughter of the river Borysthenes. This is a suggestive genealogy, indicating that the Scythian is first a son of the

God, the universal principle, yet also a child of the special environment, hinted by the Scythian river. Also that present of a plow, a yoke and an axe, falling from heaven, gives the first implements of cultivation of the soil — truly a divine present; likewise the golden bowl which the youngest son alone can handle, is what chooses him as ruler.

The Scythians regard themselves as the youngest of peoples, in contrast with the Egyptians, who deem themselves the oldest; they are the youngest, whose career indeed belongs to the future.

The historian Justin, citing another legend, says that the Scythians claim to be the oldest of peoples; but this legend of Herodotus is probably the true one, as it seems to be the appropriate one.

Such is the Scythian mythical account. Next comes the Greek mythical account, which introduces the universal Greek Hero Hercules into Scythia, who has time there to beget three sons on a native woman, half human, half serpent, representing man still in his natural state, to whom Greek civilization is brought; the result is a new race and order. Such a legend, we must think, the Greek colonies of the Euxine framed, giving a reflection of themselves and of the Greco-Scythian spirit. Another phase of Hercules, the Greek hero of culture, putting down Geryon

and Cacus, and many other barbaric monsters, we see here.

The third account tells of migrations, and does not seek to give the origin of the Scythians, but narrates how they came to their present locality. They were once in Asia and were harassed by the Massagetae, when they started westward, impinging upon the Cimmerians and driving them on before. A dark tradition of old Aryan movements from the heart of Asia would seem to lie in this statement, as if Celts (Cimmerians) were fleeing before Scyths, and Scyths were fleeing before Goths (Massagetae).

The fourth account is the work of a known man, a poet, Aristeas, being told in a poem, and is a conscious handling of the mythical element, using the same with the historical element. This poet starts the wave in the far North at the line of the Hyperboreans and the gold-guarding Griffons, where the one-eyed Arimaspians dwell; the latter tribe first impinges upon the Issedones, the Issedones upon the Scythians, and the latter upon the Cimmerians. The poet thus has his natural and supernatural forces, the latter starting and propelling the former.

Thus our historian neglects no side of human consciousness, deeming the mythical statement a phase of spirit as well as the purely historical.

The modern reader must learn to sympathize with him, to see something in all these state-

ments, of which the first two accounts for origin, the second two for migration. The first is a Scythian agricultural legend, the second is Greco-Scythic legend of colonization and culture. The first three are popular in origin, the last is individual, the work of a poet.

(3) Now we are to have the account of Herodotus, which in most respects is a reverse way to that of Aristæas. The historian begins with the fact, with Greek port of Borysthenitæ, which he doubtless visited, and he passes gradually from the actual to the fabulous tribes. First are the Callipedæ, "a Greco-Scythic race." Then follow agricultural people, till we came to a great desert beyond which to the North the Androphagi (Cannibals) dwell, who are non-Scythian. Beyond the river Tanais, to the East, dwell the Sarmatæ, non-Scythian, usually supposed to be Slavic.

Having gone beyond the bounds of Scythians proper and their neighbors (the Sarmatæ) we begin to enter a semi-mythical region. Here dwell men "bald from their birth" (23) with other peculiarities; an ideal realm is located in this land of fable, where no man receives any wrong, and where the people live chiefly from the fruit of a tree, in a kind of paradisaical innocence. Beyond "the bald men" lies the uncertain, the unknown, hence the fabulous; here are countries inhabited by goat-footed men, actual

satyrs ; then come people who “ sleep six months at a time,” manifestly a hint of a polar region (25). On a line to the east of “ the bald men ” are the Issedones, a tribe well-known ; but to the north of this tribe is again the unknown and the fabulous, in which are placed the one-eyed Arimaspians and the gold-guarding Griffons. Far up in this northern country are the Hyperboreans, with whom Greek legend has intertwined itself in a variety of ways, whereof our historian gives quite a lengthy specimen (32-36).

We can now bring before our minds the general conception of Herodotus in regard to Scythia. In a later chapter he speaks of the square which the Scythian country forms (101) ; this also we may take into our view. We are to note the gradual approach from the real to the imaginary, from the historical to the fabulous, as we pass from the known to the unknown. (1) The Hellenic colonies, the civilized border, lying on the sea-coast or not far from it. Here all is real, natural, historical. (2) The Scythian square, whose southern line rests on the sea, and so is one with the line of Greek colonies ; then it sweeps inward for four thousand stades (450 miles), passing from Greeks, through Greco-Scythian peoples to complete barbarism, and from the well-known, through the less known to the unknown. (3) Beyond the square is the advance into the mythical region, which is the

unknown or what is known only by hearsay (25-27). Thus, as we recede from the Greek world where all is clear and known, we come to the fabulous world, beyond the Rim of the Barbarians, quite like what we saw to the south of Egypt in the previous Book. Still another bound, the circumfluent ocean, was placed beyond the Hyperboreans by Hecataeus and others, but this is rejected by Herodotus "with a smile" (36). Fableland becomes actual in what is distant on Earth, and extends, without the interruption of even a fictitious sea, into the unknown. Nor should we forget that legend of the air filled with feathers, common in northern Mythology, and hinting the snow storm. Note too the story of Abaris, the Hyperborean, who carried an arrow "around the whole earth without eating anything."

Our historian again has surrounded his civilized world with a cordon of fable. The same conception essentially is found in Homer's *Odyssey*: When Ulysses is driven by the storm out of the known limits of Hellas, he comes to a Fableland in which dwell the Lotus-eaters, Polyphemus, Circe, and many other fabulous beings. In like manner, when he returns to Hellas in its known parts, such as Ithaca, these superhuman forms vanish more and more into human actors.

(4) Herodotus now takes occasion to insert an excursus on the geography of the globe, apparently being led thereto by the story of Abaris which suggests the rotundity of the earth (36). It is generally held that he must have had a map before him in the following description.

He is aware of the triple division, into Europe, Asia, and Libya, but does not know who made it, or why it was made, and is decidedly inclined to deem it inappropriate. He prefers the dual division of the world, connecting Egypt especially with Asia. The reason for this preference is not so much geographical as spiritual; it manifestly springs from his conception of the great conflict which he is recording, that between Asia and Hellas. This is the fundamental dualism of the world according to Herodotus, and for his age it was doubtless the right view.

Accordingly he runs a line of division between Europe and Asia, which line embraces the Mediterranean Sea on through the Propontis and the Euxine to the river Phasis, from which the boundary is continued by the Caspian Sea and the Araxes into the unknown. Thus the earth is divided into two halves, the northern (or Europe) and the southern (Asia and Libya). Now it was the latter which was consolidated by Persia and thrown against Greece, which was then verily the new world, and represented dawning Europe and the future.

It is interesting to note that the historian tries to give some faint glimpse of the Eastern boundary of Persia. He mentions the voyage of Scylax (44) down the Indus, "the second river that produces crocodiles," and the safe arrival of the navigator at the port of the Red Sea "in the thirtieth month." After the voyage "Darius subdued the Indians and used this sea." Persian arms did not apparently penetrate to the valley of the Ganges, but probably subdued the Punjaub.

Of these early voyages the most extensive doubtless was the circumnavigation of Africa twice, once by Phoenician and once by Carthaginian sailors, each going in opposite directions (41-3). Here occurs the striking sentence: these Phoenician sailors after their return related "what to me does not seem credible, but may to others, that, as they sailed round Libya, they had the sun on their right hand." This statement, so dubious to the historian, is now the strongest proof of the circumnavigation. So those old Semitic sailors — Phoenician and Carthaginian — anticipated Vasco de Gama in doubling the Cape of Good Hope. Striking is the contrast with the Persian attempt made apparently with Egyptian sailors (43), which attempt did not succeed.

To a certain extent we see Herodotus in these geographical matters quite behind the most

advanced views of his time. He does not believe in the rotundity of the earth, nor in the circumambient ocean, nor in the tripartite division of the continent; it is manifest that his mind was on the grand dualism between Orient and Occident, the Persian Empire and Hellas.

(5) The many rivers of Scythia roused the historian's interest, and he devotes to them quite a section here (47-58). Personally he could not have investigated these streams, the result is that his account has many mistakes of detail. Of all the most important was the Ister (Danube), which he again compares with the Nile, as he did in his Egyptian Book (II. 33). He conceived the two as counterparts, the one in the northern half of the earth, the other in the southern half, showing numerous contrasts one with the other. The Nile has no visible tributaries, the Ister has many along its whole course; the one is known, the other is unknown in origin.

(6) A few chapters are now devoted to the social life of the Scythians (59-75) — to the religion, customs, etc. It is a kind of summary of barbarous life, as nearly all rude peoples have these or similar customs. In matters of religion, the historian translates their crude deities into corresponding names of Greek Gods; Hestia, the hearth, is the chief, in her the family center is conceived; the others are more or less nature deities. No temple, altar or image for other

deities, except Mars; the savages must have their war-god, whose image is an old iron scimiter, to which many sacrifices, human and animal, are made.

The Scythian drinks the blood of his slain foe, and cuts off the head as a present to the king; he scalps his enemy and uses the scalp as a napkin, or sews a number of them together as articles of dress. He makes the skull of his foe into a drinking cup. (Compare the Teutonic Valhalla.)

The divining rod and the sooth-sayers are here, the latter are burned if they tell false. A pledge or contract involves the exchange of blood in some form, like that of Faust and Mephistopheles.

The burial of a dead king brings with it a revolting sum of barbarities. One of his concubines and his household servants must go along to provide for him beyond; so they are slain on his grave. After a year's time fifty youths, beautiful, select, are strangled, and fifty horses are impaled and fixed as if rearing, while on them are placed the fifty corpses of youths in a circle round the grave, evidently his body-guard beyond.

Most of these customs have been traced among the Calmucks and Tartars of Southern Russia of the present time, from which fact it has been inferred these Scythian peoples of

Herodotus were Turanian. But such rites and beliefs belong to all savage peoples — in Africa, in America, as well as in Asia. The first conception of immortality is that death is the change to the same kind of life beyond ; the king will want his horse, meat and drink and his attendants, even his palatial tomb. Hence these sacrifices and monuments.

(7) The fates of two Scythians who sought to introduce Hellenism into their native land are now told (76-80). The first is Anacharsis, a famous man among the Greeks, as traveler and wise man, who traveled over the world and accepted Greek religion, custom and thought. He perishes while celebrating the rites of a Greek Goddess, Cybele. The second is Scylas, who became king of a Scythian tribe, and caused a revolt of his people through his initiation into the Bacchic mysteries.

Thus we may affirm a strong conflict in the barbarous tribes of Scythia with the incoming Greek civilization. Such a conflict always rises on the border. The American Indians are divided into two parties on the same lines ; the one party will accept the civilizing tendency and will be "the friend of the white man," the other party will remain barbarian and cling to the customs of the ancestors, fighting to the death the new idea. The Creek Indians not long ago had a civil war on this question.

To these two Scythian characters, Anacharsis and Scylas, we may add the Thracian Zamolxis of the Getae (94), who evidently was a teacher of his people, teaching them chiefly the doctrine of immortality, along with Greek civilization. He is connected with Pythagoras, the great teacher of Greece, "the first pedagogue." The scheme of an underground chamber may be dismissed as the clever explanation of a smart Greek. So Zamolxis was a kind of missionary.

These three cases were of natives who brought Hellenic civilization into their own barbarous lands. But the Greeks, though hide-bound enough and vain, had their legend of the missionary, not a man, but a woman, who goes to Scythia, to the land of the Tauri, and who is regarded as a Goddess there — Iphigenia, daughter of Agamemnon. Euripides connects this story with the Trojan war in his famous dramas on the subject of Iphigenia. The Tauri are supposed to be Cimmerians by Grote, that is, Celtic, a remnant left in the Tauric country when the rest were driven out. Herodotus of course, gives no definite account of the Iphigenia legend or its purport (103).

2. *The Perisco-Scythian Thread.* The Scythian expedition of Darius is next to be recounted (83-144). A general survey of the land and its various peoples has been given in the preceding narrative; we are now to behold the Persian

monarch striking into the vast mass of barbarism and seeking to subject it to an Oriental sway. He fails, for such a result lay not in the plan of the World's History; the vast Scythian territory had to wait for its development; indeed it seems to be still waiting.

This entire section has the characteristic movement from the historical into the unhistorical, which fact we have already noticed in our historian as he passes from the civilized world to the barbarous, from the known to the less known or to the unknown. The Rim of Barbary is the realm of fable; we shall find that this expedition of Darius grows less and less credible in its details as it advances toward the North and moves into the nebulous borderland of civilization. The whole account has been doubted by high historical authority, but such skepticism is not discriminating. There was certainly an expedition of Darius to Scythia; equally certain is it that many statements here recorded about it are open to question.

In order to find the clue of the narration, we must catch the movement of the historian's mind, unfolding into his theme. We shall note that, as long as he is dealing with the transactions which took place before the crossing of the Ister (Danube), he is historical both in the general outline of events and in the essential details. But when the expedition has crossed the Danube

and taken its plunge into the barbarious regions northward, the details grow more and more dubious and unhistorical, though the general outline is still true in fact; that is, the advance of Darius into the country, the barbarian manner of warfare by retreating and harassing the invader without coming to a battle, the final retreat of Darius, must all be considered as historical. When' the expedition gets back to the Danube, it re-enters the domain of history, not only the general outline but also the details must be regarded as real.

In order to bring the preceding view into bold relief, we shall throw this account into three portions. First will be the advance of Darius to the Danube over which he builds a bridge — historical; second, is the movement into Barbary, which is also the movement and evanishment of the historical into the unhistorical; third is the return to the bridge over the Danube, which bridge also leads back into the sphere of history. Such is the general sweep which will now be given in greater fullness.

(1) The account of the expedition till the crossing of the bridge over the Ister has the air of truth, both in its general course of events and in its essential details (83-98). Darius may not have addressed "the men of Ionia" (98) in the words here set down, but there is no reasonable doubt that he left them in charge of

the bridge. In accord with the manner of Herodotus a warning is given to Darius by his brother Artabanus (83) against entering upon the unfortunate enterprise; in like manner Croesus received a warning from Sandonis (I. 71), and Xerxes will receive a warning from this same Artabanus (VII. 10). The story of the father (84) whose three sons serving in the Persian army were slain by orders of Darius, because the father asked that one of them be allowed to remain at home, has its counterpart in the similar bloody act of Xerxes (VII. 38). When the king was personally serving in the army, he resented as the direst insult any request for release from military duty; such a request was evidently regarded as a crime against majesty (*laesae majestatis*). The measurements of the Euxine and of the Palus Maeotis (Sea of Azoff) here given (86) are not accurate, still these seas are a fact, and the general outline of their description holds good to-day. So it is with the events here recorded; certain details are erroneous, but the totality is correct in the main. .

The first bridge (87) built of boats over the Bosphorus by Mandrocles the Samian architect, is duly celebrated by our historian, whose stay at Samos and whose acquaintance with Samian affairs have been already noticed in the preceding Book. It is probable that Herodotus saw the picture here mentioned and read the inscription

here quoted (both being in the temple of Samian Juno) and likewise heard all about Mandrocles, some sixty years after the building of the bridge. The Samians of this period were famous builders and artists (see III. 60).

The second bridge is thrown over the Ister at the point where the river divides into several mouths, and the work is accomplished by the Greek sailors, who go by boat over the sea to the spot. This evidently was a construction requiring much less skill than the first bridge; the builder's name is not mentioned though it was probably Mandrocles. But this second bridge has greater strategic value than the first, being a pivotal point in the expedition, as we shall see later.

Darius moves toward the Danube by land; on the way he subdues the Thracian Getae, supposed to be ancestors of the Goths and hence a Teutonic people, who are here declared to be "the most valiant and the most just of the Thracians." Moreover they believe themselves "to be immortal, and, dying, to go to the divine Zamolxis." But who was Zamolxis? Some Greeks said that he was once a Thracian slave of the Samian philosopher Pythagoras, and, going back to Thrace, carried thither these strange traces of the latter's doctrine, which, in its turn, was derived from Egypt. Evidently the legend of Zamolxis gives some far-off adumbration of the

missionary who introduced a few Greek ideas and a touch of Greek civilization into the land of the Getae, and was afterwards adored as a God. Again the historian shows his knowledge of Samian men and things, though he must also have known of Pythagoras in Italy.

At last Darius with the land forces reaches the bridge over the Ister, and is ready to take his audacious plunge into the vast unknown ocean of Barbary. He proposes at first to break up the bridge, and have the Ionians follow on land with the forces from the ships; but Coes, the general of the Mitylenians gives him a warning to secure his retreat in case of misfortune. The Persian monarch then bids the Ionians who constructed the bridge to stay and guard it for sixty days; after this time they could sail away to their country. Did Darius think of returning to Persia through the Caucasus? He doubtless expected an immediate conquest of the Barbarians, and was regardless of the more distant future; the lapse of sixty days would indicate his permanent hold on the country. At least so he seems to have thought.

(2) After crossing the Ister, Darius enters Scythia, which is the object of his expedition. An advance, a stop, and a retreat back to the starting-point make up the movement. The whole is a vain effort to strike something where there is nothing to be struck — a

blow in the water which simply yields and then closes together again. "We have no cities, no cultivated lands," says the Scythian leader; they have no fixed habitations, not even houses, but live on wheels, moving about in their carts over the vast steppes, as the Calmucks do to-day. They are thus the absolutely movable, flexible, unseizable, which Darius is going to seize.

We may first try to figure to ourselves the geographical features of the country. Herodotus conceives Scythia to be a square (*tetragonon*) having four thousand stadia to each side (say 450 miles). One side of this square rests on the Euxine from the mouth of the Ister to lake Maeotis; upon this line the square is built toward the north (101). Round this square toward the interior are grouped the peoples which are not Scythian; on the east side of the square dwell the Sauromatae, the Tauri, the Geloni and Budini; on the north side the Melanchlaeni (Black Coats), the Androphagi (Man Eaters), and the Neuri; on the west side the Agathyrsi. Thus our historian marks out his Scythian pale with definite measurements; yet this pale lies outside his civilized pale already designated.

Concerning all these nations beyond the Scythian pale he adds a few touches more or less fabulous (103-117). The Tauri, who offer human sacrifices to their Goddess, are connected with

the Greek legend of Iphigenia, Agamemnon's daughter, who is represented to have been borne to their land miraculously when she was about to be immolated by her father at Aulis. Evidently this is another story of the Greek missionary, now a woman in barbarous lands, which facts the Greek Mythus did not fail of embodying. Euripides, a younger contemporary of Herodotus, has given a dramatic form to the tale in his "*Iphigenia in Taurus*," which has had many reproductions (notably Goethe's). The Agathyrsi have their wives in common, "to the end that all children born may be brothers and of one family" — which realizes an idea advanced by Plato in his *Republic*, this philosopher being also a younger contemporary of the historian. The intermingling of the Budini and the Geloni is suggestive; the former are savages, nomads, who paint their bodies and live on vermin; the latter dwell in cities (Gelonus), till the soil, eat corn, and differ from the Budini both in shape and complexion; a primitive and an advanced people are inhabiting the same land. Into the account of the Sauromatae the legend of the Amazons is interwoven; thus only can be explained the position of women in that tribe. In such fashion the Greek historian introduces the Greek Mythus among the barbarous nations outside of the Scythian pale; some of the Greek Gods are also found there, and one of these

peoples, the Geloni, are declared to have been originally Greeks (108).

There is no complete unity of all these scattered tribes against the attack of Darius, still he can take nothing where there is nothing to take. Individuals he can capture, but there are no fixed abodes, no settled habits of life. Striking is the resemblance of this campaign of Darius to the campaign of Napoleon in the same general locality twenty-three centuries later. The enemy are mounted, but will not come to an open fight; they hover on the flanks, harass, waylay, Cosack-like; the Budini and Geloni set fire to their own capital city, quite as Moscow was burnt. Darius begins to throw up forts for quarters, but concludes to make a retreat, which is also disastrous; the Scythian horsemen likewise wheel about and follow up their old tactics.

Darius had repeatedly demanded of the Scythians earth and water, symbols of submission. In their turn the Scythians send a bird, a mouse, and a frog, with five arrows to the Persian king; what does such a message mean? A double interpretation is given, one implying submission, the other quite the reverse. At last the opinion of Gobryas prevailed, which ran as follows: "Unless ye, O Persians, become birds and fly into the air, or become mice and hide yourselves in the earth, or become frogs and leap into the ponds, ye shall never return

home, but be stricken with these arrows." Such was this symbolic play, evidently a product of Greek fancy, playing a variation on the well-known Persian symbols of earth and water, yet imaging the great emergency of Darius.

(3) The bridge at the crossing of the Ister again begins to appear in the narrative (133), and we feel once more that a fresh historical element starts to show itself. Some Scythians arrive and confer with the Ionians in charge of the bridge, exhorting them to leave when the sixty days have passed. Meanwhile the Persian retreat evidently becomes a flight; the Scythians now draw up in line of battle (134), but the Persians decline the challenge, and slip away in stealth by night.

Again the Scythians appear at the bridge and begin to reproach the Ionians for staying so long on guard, as their term of sixty days had already expired. Here the Greek begins to show himself, the dualism which is later to develop into revolt appears. A consultation is held; Histiaeus, the tyrant of Miletus, saves the bridge and the Persian army, since he saw in the power of Darius his own safety and that of the other tyrants; "every one of us holds his own city through Darius." But Miltiades, the Athenian, who was "tyrant of Chersonesus," gave the opinion that "they should comply with the request of the Scythians, and free Ionia." Mark

this Miltiades, we shall hear of him later at the battle of Marathon. Now he is "a tyrant," holding one-man power over a Greek city, yet voting "to free Ionia." The only person then in authority who gave such a vote, standing quite alone: "all went over to the side of Histiaeus." The author at this point publishes the roll of Greek tyrants, who in such a crisis refused to undo the Persian and "to free Ionia" — evidently a kind of black list, with names forever accursed and detested by every patriotic Greek.

So the two sides have risen to light, each with its prominent representative; both men will yet have a history. The heroic man who is destined to give to Persia her first great defeat in the West now steps forward and takes his stand as the grand protagonist of Greek freedom; already at the bridge over the Ister he shows the spirit of Marathon. Histiaeus, however, deceives the Scythians by a cunning Greek trick and saves Darius along with the remnants of his army.

Such is the prophetic incident foreshadowing much to come.

Darius hurries back to Persia, somewhat as his son Xerxes will do hereafter upon witnessing the battle of Salamis. An inglorious expedition; still he leaves behind him his general, Megabyzus, apparently his most trusted officer, who conquers the Greek colonies and Hellenized peoples in the north around the Propontis. This is an impor-

tant conquest, it opens a path for the Persian into Europe, which he will take rather than sail across the sea. Miltiades was probably driven out of the Chersonesus in the course of this conflict and returned to Athens, where he will take ample revenge, doubtless using his experience in Persian warfare to train the Athenians. Thus Darius has obtained a foothold in Europe, and the Orient has taken a decided step in advance toward the great struggle which is approaching.

In the present section the historian being of Doric stock, appears to show some of the deep-rooted prejudices of his tribe against the Ionians. There is an evident ironical tinge in what he says about "the Ionic mode of life" (as contrasted with the simpler and sterner Dorian) as well as about "the more refined manners" of the Ionians (95). Pythagoras, the Samian sage (the Samians were Ionic) he seems to regard as a kind of charlatan who taught Zamolxis to bamboozle the ignorant Thracians into believing that he was immortal, through the trick of vanishing and staying in an underground habitation for three years and then reappearing. But in the reproaches of the Scythians to the Ionians for not breaking up the bridge, the tone becomes one of acrid sarcasm: "the Ionians, when free, are the basest and most cowardly of all men, but when slaves, are the most servile and obedient." Certainly the voice of historian mingles

in this stinging rebuke ; still we must recollect that Miltiades and the Athenians also belonged to the Ionic tribe. It is likewise probable that Herodotus during his visit to the Euxine may have heard from living lips these reproaches ; for the Scythians, after the defeat and flight of Xerxes, would naturally claim that they would have whipped the Persian worse than the Greeks did, had it not been for those cringing, lying slaves, the Ionians, who kept the bridge for the escape of Darius, after giving their promise to return home. Clearly the historian has his secret pleasure in the taunt, though he puts it into the mouths of the Scythians.

Some, of the most distinguished modern writers, who have reviewed this account of Herodotus, have agreed in regarding the expedition of Darius as incredible (Grote, Thirlwall, Niebuhr). But we believe this can be shown to be an indiscriminating skepticism. That there are fictitious elements in the narrative must be granted ; but these can be separated from the historic kernel by the careful student. We have already noted that it is the Herodotean manner to weave around the reality a garb of fiction, and that, as our historian moves towards the bounds of his world, he becomes more and more mythical. The rejection of the Scythian expedition carries with it the rejection of the Libyan and the Aethiopian expeditions. Nobody

will say that all the details in each of these cases are true; the outline is true and can be distinguished from the fictitious. To be sure there are some special events in regard to which the boundary between historical and unhistorical cannot be laid down. The discriminating reader will, therefore, make three gradations in the narrative: the certainly historical, the uncertain, and the certainly fictitious. Moreover we must compare Herodotus with himself, and seek to discover his law; then we shall find that this Scythian expedition is not isolated in its treatment, but is harmonious with other parts of his history, and, more deeply still, is harmonious with his spirit, with his historic consciousness.

Certain improbabilities on physical grounds are often alleged in regard to the expedition. For example, it is claimed not to be likely that the Persian army could cross such large rivers as the Don, Dnieper, and the Bog, which are found in southern Russia (Scythia). But it is certain that the Persian armies of Asia knew how to cross the even larger rivers of their own domains, such as the Tigris, Euphrates, Indus, and must have had a good deal of experience in the matter. Again, it is affirmed to be improbable that the Persian army could transport or find sustenance for such a large body of men and animals in its long march over the steppes of Scythia. Still Oriental armies of large numbers have crossed

the vast deserts of the Orient, where there was not even vegetation or water. Doubtless Persian generals knew what measures to take in such an emergency. Thus the two chief physical improbabilities vanish, on examination, into their opposite. (See Rawlinson's Translation of Herodotus, note to Chap. 142 of the present Book).

II.

We now come to the counterpart of the Persian expedition against Scythia, namely, the Persian expedition against Libya (Africa), which takes up the rest of the Book (145-205). The movement of this portion is essentially the same as the preceding; each is seen to be harmoniously adjusted to the other in structure, and the fundamental thought is one. The Persian strikes against the outlying barbarous nations, he tries to beat down the grand limit of uncivilized peoples which hems him in. Moreover the same Greek element plays into the second portion as into the first, namely, the colonized Greek element, which has also in its way laid hold of Barbary. But in the last case there is an important difference in treatment; the Greek thread of colonization is quite fully developed in the second portion, whereas it remains undeveloped by the historian in the first portion, though it be present and active.

There are likewise contrasts between the two portions. The one expedition is in the North, the other is in the South, Hellas lying in the middle, which fact suggested her own spiritual position and character (hinted in her apothegms, *no excess, the golden mean*). Her civilization lay between North and South, East and West, heat and cold, between extremes generally. The Scythian expedition was commanded by the king in person, the Libyan by the general of a satrap. This satrap, called Aryandes, directed his arms first against Barke, a Greek colony, but the historian says that this was but a pretext, and that the satrap intended to subdue the Libyans, "as the greater part of the latter paid no heed to Darius" (167). The limit must be broken down in Libya also — which well accords with what we already know of Persian spirit.

In this second or Libyan division of the Fourth Book we shall have, therefore, three divisions, as follows:—

1. The Greek Thread, giving an account of the Greek colonies in Libya (145–167).
2. The Barbaric Thread, giving an account of tribes and natives of Libya, with the physical characteristics of the country (168–199).
3. The Persian Thread, giving an account of the Persian satrap's expedition against Libya (200–205).

It will be observed that the last is treated very

briefly, while the Greek and Barbaric Threads are unfolded at some length. The reader will note the general symmetry of this second division of the Book with the first; the one is structurally a repetition of the other, with the addition of the Greek Thread interwoven in the second division.

1. *The Greco-Libyan Thread.* Already the fact has been remarked that the Greek element, which is treated of in connection with other matters in the first portion, now receives a full and separate development. What caused this difference of treatment on the part of the historian? What made him give such a detailed and distinct account of the colonization of Cyrene, while the important Greek colonies of the North are quite cursorily dismissed? Of course the reasons can only be surmised. It may here be noted that Herodotus was born in a Dorian colony, of Dorian parentage doubtless; in spite of his warm admiration for certain Ionic cities, as Athens and Samos, he had a strong undercurrent of Dorism in his nature, which often shows itself by his unfavorable comments on the Ionic character in general. Now the colonizing movement from Sparta through Thera to Cyrene was essentially Doric. It is also clear that Herodotus had some special source of information about this movement. Such information he may not have had concerning colonies northward which were largely

of Ionic origin. Samos plays quite an important part in this account of Cyrene; our historian's stay at Samos must have furnished him with a number of facts, some of which have a personal and local stamp (152).

But that which especially fascinated our historian in this account of colonizing Cyrene, was the part taken by the Delphic Oracle, which here assumes a more authoritative position than anywhere else in the entire History. Only in the First Book in the narrative about Croesus is the Oracle as prominent, and there it is not so commanding. The whole scheme of colonization seems to be directed from Delphi; indeed we may say it is forced upon an unwilling though obedient community. Herodotus loved and revered the Delphic Oracle in common with the whole Dorian brotherhood; he takes particular pains to interweave its influence and its responses into Greek affairs. With the Greek Pantheon as shown by Homer he evidently has not much sympathy; to a certain extent he has broken with the old faith; his religious nature is, however, not by any means destroyed but finds expression in the oracular element; in particular the Delphic Oracle is his divine Providence, his Zeus. Thus we may in part account for the fullness with which he sets forth the present section. Nor should we forget that Herodotus probably had his oracular period which had its culmination

when this section was written, and when he felt a strong Doric influence. The Ionic influence was different, more of a free-thinking cast; we heard little about oracles in the Samian history of the preceding Book, and in the later Books which deal with Athenian history, the oracular element will be present, but in diminishing energy. We shall see what Themistocles did with a Delphic response.

(1) The colonization of Thera by Greeks (145-149) is first told and is connected remotely with a famous legend, that of the Argonauts, whose descendants, the Minyae, come to Sparta, and are fraternally adopted into the Spartan community; but they grow insolent, are thrown into prison, escape through a stratagem of their Spartan wives; part of them are taken by Theras, who is dissatisfied with his condition at Sparta, to help found a colony at Thera. This was an island of the Aegaeon, most southern of the group called Cyclades, and had been settled already by the Phoenicians, whose settlement there was traced back to Cadmus, when he came westward in quest of Europa. Thus both the Greek and the Phoenician colonization is referred to a mythical origin, which passes over into history; we observe again how Herodotus makes the historical rise out of the mythical.

It is manifest that this colonizing scheme is the offspring of discontent at home. The leader,

Theras, once ruler of Sparta as guardian of his royal nephews, "thought it awful to be ruled by others when he had once tasted of power (147.)" The Minyae were in a kind of revolt; to those were added other people from Sparta, doubtless also dissatisfied. This colonization gave a vent for the discontented spirits of the country; so it has often done since. Thera has in this way made the transition from a Phoenician to a Greek settlement, though much mixed in population.

(2) The colonizing movement from Thera to Cyrene is next told (150-9). The Delphic Oracle now enters with a persistent response, commanding those in authority "to build a city in Libya." But the order is not obeyed, the result is "no rain fell in Thera for seven years." Thus the Oracle punishes for non-compliance. There are two stories told about the matter, but both agree in showing that the purpose of the Oracle is to compel the Theraeans to colonize Libya. They were probably nearest to Libya of all those whom the Oracle might so authoritatively command; they were Dorian, and came from Sparta, and hence were intimately connected with Delphi. It is evident, however, that they were very unwilling and strongly reacted from the enterprise. In the North, the East and the West, Greek colonies had been planted; the South, too, must not be neglected. Colonization was the Greek method of conquering Barbary, quite in contrast

with the Persian method. Herein the Oracle appears as the representative and promoter of a certain phase of Greek spirit, lashing the more backward communities to make them do their part in the new movement. Battus, the leader, and his colonists lose heart and come back to Thera from Libya, but are not permitted to land; they return and settle on an island, Platea, but this is an evasion of the Oracle, which gives them no peace till they go to the mainland and found Cyrene.

Such was the long wearisome struggle laid upon a Greek community by the Oracle for the support of a plan of colonization. While the barbarians began to be Hellenized, there was also conflict; the natives did not calmly permit the new-comers to take their lands. The Libyans called in Egypt, which also had its jealousy roused by the new Greek community. The result was a war in which the Egyptians were beaten; the Greek colonies of Libya assert themselves against all enemies in that quarter till the Persian (Cambyses) appears.

There is a passage (152) which probably hints the source whence Herodotus derived the details of the colonization of Thera and Cyrene. A Samian vessel left "provisions for a year" to a solitary remaining colonist on the island of Platea — "from which act the Theraeans and the Cyreneans contracted great friendship for the

Samians." As our historian lived for a time, possibly more than once, at Samos, he had the opportunity of learning all about the history of Thera and Cyrene here given. Moreover his special interest was roused by hearing it with all the particulars, even with different versions of the same story — Greek fancy spinning itself around the historic fact, as usual.

(3). From outer prosperity we pass to inner troubles which afflict Cyrene as they do every Greek city (159-67). The Oracle has specially helped the Libyan colony, which it apparently regards as its own fosterling, having published to all Greeks the following oracular advertisement on the occasion of an allotment of land: "Whoever comes too late to lovely Libya, will repent of his delay, the land having been divided." This division took place under the second Bathus, apparently some sixty or seventy years after the founding of the city, and greatly increased the population, as we see by the fact that the city at once could defeat the Egyptian army, and later could lose 7,000 heavy-armed soldiers without being undone.

This success was soon accompanied by domestic strife, which began in the royal family; some princes quarreling with their brother on the throne, quit Cyrene and founded Barke; which became an important town and long outlasted Cyrene. Revolt of the native Libyans followed,

and then war, the outcome of which was the slaughter of 7,000 Cyreneans. The king was murdered by his brother and this brother was murdered in turn by the king's wife. The royal family had an African strain of barbarism and cruelty in its members, through intermarriage with native princes. It is no wonder that we read of popular discontent with such rulers at the helm in a city which must have been Greek chiefly after the allotment of lands. Again the Oracle at Delphi is invoked, to which it is plain that the people naturally looked in the emergency; note that the Cyreneans, not the king, called in the Oracle, which commands them to get an arbitrator from Mantinea, a city famous in Greece for its good government.

Thus Demonax is sent to Cyrene and makes what would be called in our time a new constitution. He was probably the best fitted man of the period through personal character and talents, and therefore was selected by the Delphic wise men before the matter was handed over to Mantinea. Then Mantinea was not Doric or Ionic, but Pelasgic; its citizen would not be warped by a tribal connection, which no doubt caused part of the trouble at Cyrene. We see by his division into three tribes what some of the difficulties were; he made one tribe of old settlers (Theraeans and their dependents), another of Peloponnesian and Cretans (Doric), another of the

Islanders (Ionic). The last two contained probably most of the new-comers, who now obtained important political rights, which had before been denied.

The king, on the other hand, is shorn of his political prerogatives, though he is retained in his religious capacity as priest (Rawlinson compares *rex sacrificulus* at Rome and *archon basileus* at Athens in republican times). The king has also his allotments of land. This constitution has a decided democratic look, and shows that Cyrene was following the strong political tendency of the age.

One king, the lame Battus, submitted to the new order during his life; but after his death, his son and his wife make trouble. The son, called Arcesilaus, "demands back the prerogatives of his ancestors." At first the two are defeated in an uprising; the son goes to Samos and collects a band of adventurers, while the mother, Phere-time, goes to King Euelthon, of Salamis in Cyprus, praying for help. The Delphic Oracle, too, is invoked, this time by the king, which now strongly encourages him, though it had before favored the people and caused the sending of Demonax. Probably the new constitution was too democratic to be acceptable to the Doric sentiment of Delphi, hence the change. For the Oracle does not merely prophesy, it is also directive. It bids the king, however, to be

moderate after his return and "not to bake the amphorae in a hot furnace," but the king, being successful in his attempt to return to Cyrene, with the characteristic cruelty of his house did "bake the amphorae;" the result was that he as well as "the beautiful bull" (an obscure designation of his father-in-law Alazir, king of Barke) perished, as the Oracle had foretold.

The Delphic Oracle has been invoked by both sides, and has interfered in favor of both sides — the people and the king; also it has sought to keep both in the bounds of moderation; evidently without success. The people, having obtained the power, used it to do wrong against others, according to an allusion in Aristotle (*Pol.* VI. 2); in like manner the king, having returned to power, uses it for revenge, as we see in the present narrative. The Oracle is, however, recognized, as a kind of medieval papal authority, and tries to hold the balance between both parties.

Pheretime, the king's mother, stays at Cyrene after her son's departure, and exercises authority for a time; but she flees to Egypt after her son's death at Barke, and there invokes the interference of the Persian. Already the king, Arcesilaus, had "given Cyrene to Cambyses and imposed on himself a tribute (165)." In this fact we may see one ground of discontent with the royal family: it had handed a free Greek city over to the rule of Persia.

2. *The Barbarico-Libyan Thread* (168-199).

This interference of the Persian is the historian's occasion for introducing his account of the barbarous peoples of Libya in correspondence with the account of the barbarous peoples of Scythia previously given in the present Book. Moreover the correspondence is carried still further: as the Persian intended to subdue barbaric Scythia, so now he intends to subdue barbaric Libya; thus the two acts have their common root in Persian policy, or in Persian spirit. It is true that Dahlmann in his *Life of Herodotus* has chosen to cast suspicion upon any such design of subduing Libya on the part of the Persian, but his statement is without any historic basis, wholly drawn from his inner consciousness — wherein he receives the approval of Rawlinson (*ad loc.*). But the historian knew the fact and especially knew the Persian character, of which the fact is but a manifestation, far better than either of his modern commentators.

On the sea-coast of Libya at different places two sets of foreigners had settled: the Greek and the Phœnician, the one represented by Cyrene, the other by Carthage. Besides these two cities of foreigners, were the native Libyan peoples, which the historian is now going to tell of and to order after a fashion, which we shall try to set forth.

There are three tracts or zones of land extending across Northern Libya in parallel lines (181). First of these is the coast zone, then is the wild beast zone, finally is the sand zone. In general, this physical outline of Northern Africa holds good to-day. The three zones exist but not so regular and parallel as Herodotus seems to think; nature has her order but also she has her caprices. The second zone (here called the wild beast tract) is really a hilly country, whose product is chiefly dates, according to modern travelers. The desert of Sahara may in general pass for the third zone, though Herodotus hardly knew of its extent. The greatest modern geographers, Ritter and Humboldt, divide Northern Africa into three belts, somewhat after the fashion of our historian, with the correction of minor details.

(1) The beginning is made with Egypt, from which the account moves westward to lake Tritonis, giving the coast zone of peoples (168-80), all of which are nomads. But beyond these, to the west of lake Tritonis dwell the Libyans who are agriculturists (191-5). The name of this lake calls up a fund of Greek legend; the omnipresent Argo sailed thither, and a Triton appeared to Jason, announcing that "a hundred Greek cities would be built around lake Tritonis" in a certain case, which never came to pass, however. One of these Libyan tribes claimed to

be descended from Trojan fugitives (191); a similar claim was afterward made for Romans and other Italians, and was elaborated by the poet Virgil. Greek story is evidently interweaving Libya; Greek explorers had probably looked at the region about lake Tritonis as a suitable spot for extensive colonization; an oracle had commanded the Lacedemonians to colonize an island in the lake; but the plan was never realized. It is interesting to note this outlook of Hellenic civilization on the African coast.

(2) The wild beast zone is not very distinctly described by Herodotus, though he plainly designates it as lying inland, beyond the coast line (181). But when he comes to tell about western Libya (191), he speaks of the region of the agricultural Libyans (the Maxyes) as abounding in wild beasts, thickly wooded and mountainous. Thus the western coast tract and the parallel wild beast tract seem to run together in his description. In the main his account of the animals, huge serpents and physical characteristics of this region is correct, though it goes over into the fabulous in the case of "men with no heads, having their eyes in their breasts." He claims to have investigated the matter with the greatest care (192), he shows the scientific spirit, and it is interesting to note the confirmation of his statements by modern travelers in the essential points.

(3) The next parallel band is the sand zone (181) which "extends from Egyptian Thebes to the Pillars of Hercules," that is, from the Nile to the Atlantic Ocean. Here again the regularity is striking. "At intervals of a ten days' journey over this sand ridge, are pieces of salt in large lumps on hills; on the top of each hill, out of the salt, a spring gushes forth, of water cold and sweet." Here dwell the men of the desert. The first of these stations, or oases, is that of the Ammonians, where is the shrine of Jupiter Ammon, Jupiter with the head of a ram, which image penetrated Egyptian and even Greek mythology.

Modern researches have shown that the statements of Herodotus in regard to the springs, and salt, and distances are based on fact, though not always accurate. He describes substantially a caravan route through the desert, passing from oasis to oasis. The general aspect of the country, the salt houses, the peoples can still be verified; even the Troglodytes, the cave-dwellers, very swift of foot, are pointed out in the Tibboos, living in the mountain-caves south of Fezzan. The zone continues to the Atlantes, a people named from Mount Atlas near by; with which mountain the narrative enters the realm of Greek mythology, since Atlas is celebrated in the Greek poets (Homer, Hesiod, Aeschylus) as the giant holding the pillars of Heaven. Thus

does the actual run over into the fabulous on the borders of the world.

It may be said that nature herself has a fabulous aspect in this part of the globe, and that the historian had some provocation for lapsing into the mythical through the very form of the actual. The man in these regions approaches the animal, as the Troglodyte; then the animal approaches man, as the gorilla and the chimpanzee; there is the small man, the pigmy, and the prodigious animal, snake, crocodile or lizard. The wonders of nature are real in this southern latitude; while in the cold north they are more or less fictitious. Possibly it was through his Libyan and Egyptian experience that Herodotus came to believe that the extremes of the earth produce marvels.

It has been already noted that the Greek cities have a tendency to become Africanized. The women of Cyrene, native and mixed, will not eat of the flesh of the cow, since it is sacred to Isis; nor will the women of Barke partake of swine's flesh — both pointing to customs like those of Egypt. The Greek colonists in many cases married native women, though the men were continually reinforced by newcomers from Greece. Particularly the royal houses of Cyrene and Barke show an African strain.

On the other hand we observe everywhere traces of the Hellenization of the indigenous

Libyan races. Just as in the North, the barbarous peoples of the South could not help being influenced by Greek civilization. Commerce led the way; Greek trinkets were a training out of savagery, Greek art and Greek mythology found their way into the African soul. Especially the tribes along the coast manifest something of the Greek presence.

But the greatest, most important and most celebrated city that ever existed in Northern Africa Herodotus gives no account of, though he alludes to it — Carthage. When he passes beyond lake Tritonis westward (191–5), he approaches this city, but instead of a detailed description, he only cites what the Carthaginians say about some other countries besides their own. A plain avoidance of the subject; why? It tallies with his treatment of the Phoenicians, who colonized Carthage, yet he visited the cities of Phoenicia, and may have visited Carthage. The statements of Carthaginians are quoted as if he had heard them personally; where or how? Silence; the result is that the distinctive Semitic thread of the world's civilization quite drops out of his history; Judea, Phoenicia, Syria, Carthage have no adequate showing therein.

The historian evidently visited Cyrene, he speaks of a statue which he saw there (II. 181). In this city he probably obtained a good deal of his knowledge of the interior. Concerning

the sand zone and its characteristics the natural place for information was Egypt; doubtless some of the Greeks of Naucratis had made the journey by caravan, and would be ready to recount their travels to an inquisitive countryman. A guide-book also may have been accessible, and books of former travelers had been written for a reading public.

3. *The Persico-Libyan Thread* (200-5). The Persian satrap Aryandes moves from Egypt against the Greek city, Barke, but his expedition is intended to conquer the Libyans. Such is the general ground of the war, though a personal reason is also assigned, as usual — the revenge of a woman, Pheretime, who had fled to Egypt (165) on the death of her son at the hands of the Barkaeans. There she was a suppliant to the satrap, saying that her son had lost his life in consequence of his attachment to the Persians, whose policy was to support the tyrants of the Greek cities against popular government. Already this son, when king of Cyrene, had given the city up to Cambyses, and had thereby without doubt caused a revulsion among the people. So the tyrants looked to Persia, and Persia supported the tyrants (see the speech of Histiaeus, tyrant of Miletus, 137). In like manner the invasion of Scythia was attributed to a personal ground: Darius wished to avenge the Scythian invasion of Asia. But such individual motives,

even if they exist, play upon the surface of great events, which spring from a far deeper source.

The Barkaeans fought bravely against the Persians, who, under the lead of Amasis (soon to be king of Egypt) were able finally to capture the city by a lying stratagem; thus again those truth-loving Persians resort to falsehood and breach of faith. The conduct of Cyrene in this affair is exceedingly dubious; perhaps she was willing to see a rival city destroyed — a too frequent Greek characteristic. When Barke was undone, Cyrene was eager to get the Egyptians out of her territory. The expedition on its march homewards was much harassed by the Libyans, and ended with little glory; even Pheretime soon fled back to Egypt, for she probably did not feel safe in her own country after her terrible revenge, worthy of an African queen. She impaled her male enemies around the city, and, cutting off the breasts of their wives, hung them upon its walls. She did not, however, end her life happily; she became diseased, and her body, while living, swarmed with maggots — a malady which afflicted other heroes of cruelty in antiquity (Herod, Sulla). “Hateful to the Gods are the extremes of human vengeance,” saith our historian in his moralizing vein. Both son and mother get their own — wherewith the section ends.

Those of the unhappy Barkaeans, who remained alive, were transported to Bactria, to the remotest country on the other side of the Persian Empire, where they inhabited a town called Barke, "still down to my day" says the historian, over half a century afterwards. Possibly Herodotus visited the town; he seems to have taken especial interest in those unfortunate countrymen of his who had been torn from Hellas and hopelessly transplanted into distant Asia, still retaining their language, and probably their customs and their worship. (See the case of Eretria, VI. 119.)

Pheretime, in spite of her Greek name, shows her non-Greek tendency by not appealing to the Delphic Oracle in her emergency, but to the Persian power. Even her son had consulted the Pythia, and had received a favorable response, but when he had succeeded he did not obey the oracular warning. So she in this regard violates the grand precedent of Cyrene, both of rulers and people.

The Oracle declares that there will be eight kings of this royal house (*Battiadae*), four by the name of Battus and four by the name of Arcesilaus (163). The chronology of these eight kings is not ascertainable to the year, but its general outline can be determined. Solinus gives the date 597 B. C. for the founding of Cyrene, Eusebius places it earlier, in 631

B. C. The latter date seems to be preferable (see Rawlinson, note to IV. 163). The following table furnishes an approximation:—

Battus I. (founder of the city), reigned 40 years...	631 B. C.
Arcesilaus I. (his son), reigned 16 years (159).....	591 B. C.
Battus II. (called the Happy—great increase in population)	575 B. C.
Arcesilaus II. (trouble in the royal family—Barke founded).....	555 B. C.
Battus III. (the Lame—Demonax, the lawgiver)...	540 B. C.
Arcesilaus III. (refuses to accept the new constitution).....	530 B. C.
Battus IV. (period of Pheretime as regent, king's grandmother).....	514 B. C.
Arcesilaus IV. (time of Herodotus)	470 B. C.

The historian probably saw the end of the dynasty in his own day, and the fulfilment of the oracle.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS.

With the conclusion of the Fourth Book we have reached a distinct turning-point in the total History of Herodotus. We pass, gradually it is true, into a new stage of its unfolding; in a sense, all that is gone before is but a vast preparation for what is to follow. The conflict between Hellas and Persia, between Occident and Orient, hitherto more or less latent, now becomes open, explicit, the plain, historic fact.

Moreover, the work of Herodotus is divided into two parts very nearly equal at the line of separation between the Fourth and Fifth Books. That is, the first half of the work is done, the second half must next begin. It is well to observe this proportion even in the matter of quantity, for we have already noticed that our historian was thoughtful of it apparently in limiting his account to Lower Egypt (Book II), and in omitting his entire Assyrian history (Book I). So we may take pleasure in this evidence of artistic

symmetry, conscious or unconscious, shown by the old historian.

I. THE PRECEDING FOUR BOOKS. A look backward at some of the leading points which have been brought to light, may now be taken. A certain unity we shall find in the first four Books considered by themselves; certain important matters are concluded, while certain others begin or assume a new prominence.

1. The Rim of Barbary has quite fully unfolded itself, and will hereafter almost disappear from the movement of the History, or be mentioned in a subordinate way. Still it is implied. In the Fourth Book, as just developed, we saw in strong outline the demarkation of the Scythian Rim in the North and the Libyan Rim in the South; in the previous Books he have taken note of Eastern portions of the Rim, and even of Western. This uncivilized Rim, surrounding the whole civilized world of antiquity, Greek as well as Persian, suggests the limit to that world, and its chief future conflict.

2. We have witnessed, in the preceding Books, the dealings of the Persian with the barbarous border encompassing him on nearly every side. He, fretting against all external limitation, has sought to subject this Rim of Barbary, but he has been thrown back from it with violence at every point attempted. The entire series of Persian monarchs — Cyrus, Cambyses,

Darius — have tried their hand in this business, and have had their bounds drawn against them, external primarily, but also internal. There remains the civilized bound, that of Hellas, about which will transpire the coming conflict of this History.

3. A great movement of the World's History pertains to the treatment of this Rim of uncivilized peoples. The Greek knew the fact and called those outside of his pale by the name of Barbarians; the Jew knew it also and designated the outsider as a Gentile; the Christian, despite his missionary spirit (or possibly in consequence of it) still finds his Rim of Barbary in the name and fact of Heathendom. So the old Historian has laid down a line which has not yet vanished, and will not vanish for some time to come. What shall be done with the Barbarian (the Turk just at present) is still something of a practical problem in History; and the question, Which are the Heathen, has yet to be fully answered.

4. In the previous four Books we have witnessed the growth and consolidation of the Persian Empire which has united under one absolute monarch the whole of Western and Middle Asia. The First Book showed us the rise and conquests of the founder, Cyrus; the Third Book told of the addition of Egypt by Cambyses as well as the subjection of Samos; the Fourth Book shows still further conquest and inner organiza-

tion through Darius. Such is the Persian, or the movement of Persia, which, however, has taken place inside the Rim of Barbary, from which the mighty empire has been thrown back, as from a vast wall of circumvallation.

5. The result is, as already hinted, the grand conflict between Hellas and Asia has become sharply drawn, and the line of battle in a general way has been laid down. The two combatants have begun to array themselves along that line, which will indeed fluctuate, yet will become more and more distinct as the decisive time approaches. Both sides are conscious of the coming struggle.

II. THE FOLLOWING FIVE BOOKS. The careful reader will feel that the movement from the Fifth to the end of the Ninth Book has a character and content of its own, though very intimately and organically connected with the preceding Books. The consolidation of the Persian Empire is completed, there will be no more interweaving of Oriental peoples conquered by Persia. In fact, the distinctively Oriental portion of the History is done, the stress will be henceforth upon the Hellenic portion. To be sure, there has been a Greek Thread from the beginning, still it has been, on the whole, subordinate to the Oriental element; it was undeveloped, as Greece herself was not yet developed, but is now to be developed. Likewise there will be still an Oriental Thread, very important; Greece, however, is the center

of interest, and determines the whole historical character of the period, while previously the Orient was in the main the determining principle. Such is the transition, here to be noted, yet hereafter to be gradually unfolded into its full significance.

1. The locality of the historical action is henceforth to be essentially the same throughout, not scattered over Asia and Africa, and also over Greece, as has been the case hitherto. There is now a general movement of concentration, in space as well as in the thing to be done; Persia is solidified, even the Greek States begin to show some signs of unity and co-operation. The place where the conflict is to transpire is getting marked out, and we begin to see the battle line between Orient and Occident drawn round the shores of the Aegæan. Also the contending forces are gradually taking their positions. The three grand acts of the coming drama, the Ionic Revolt, the battle of Marathon, the expedition of Xerxes show indeed the three unities of Place, Time and Action, to which may be added a clear defining of the principle involved in the conflict.

2. Herewith the historic character of the work becomes more pronounced, the mythical element recedes into the background, though it by no means vanishes wholly. As the author comes back home to his Hellas, the center of intelligence, the consciousness of History

grows clearer and dominates his spirit; as he withdraws from "the extremities of the world," from the distant in Space as well as from the remote in Time, Fableland with its twilight passes away before the rising sun of Greece. Still he would not be the Father of History, unless he were so responsive to the mythical, imaginative element which is antecedent to History; thus he can construct a bridge in himself and in his work out of the prehistoric into the historic world, of which bridge we are perchance now passing the topmost arch.

3. There is no doubt that the style changes in subtle correspondence with the change of the theme. There is still the love of the marvelous, but the direct historic fact rules the narrative, though the miracle is not left away. The Oracle has still its part, but it must be rightly interpreted by intelligence, especially at Athens. The previous Books show more the traveler, the succeeding Books show more the historian. Not so much a description of places and of tribes, as the record of events are we henceforth to have; the human deed is told, while the superhuman marvel hovers still around it, in a ghostly way. The main charm of the style is this naive responsiveness to all the changeful hues shooting through the movement of a great epoch.

4. We observe still the mighty necessity of the Persian to find his limit on every side. Bar-

barism conquers him chiefly by its desolation, almost by its yielding passivity; but now he meets a people who are going to conquer him by their activity. That Persian people — what a task was put upon them and how faithfully they labored at it! For they too had a national idea which fought valiantly for a place in the World's History; that idea was somehow to realize the Universal in Space; the infinitude of mind they tried to make actual by destroying every external limit. So they surge forth against every boundary, civilized and barbarous, trying to find the great boon, the Universal, outside of themselves, and therein fighting for their very existence. Desperate was their final attempt to obtain that beautiful Hellas, the future inheritance of the race. A small, poor, stony, mountainous country; what was it worth? One cannot help admiring the right instinct of Persia in trying to get hold of this grand spiritual treasure; but she thought she could seize it externally — a great mistake. Thus little Hellas became the mightiest limit to Persia and the Orient, a limit of spirit, for in that petty, barren country had risen the principle of the Individual with his idea of freedom, who alone can resist the all-devouring Universal of the Orient. Nay, the Greek will begin to take up into himself that Universal, making it internal for all time in thought through poetry and phi-

losophy, but politically and socially he will go to pieces in the process.

But now we are to see Persia toiling at her problem with an enormous outlay of power, with a truly Oriental colossality in her endeavor. The Occidental reader very naturally sympathizes with Greece, almost to the point of patriotic fervor; but let him also try to see that Persia as well as Greece was seeking to fulfill her world-historical destiny with untold labor and sacrifice; Persia, too, was fighting for an idea; this idea, likewise, we should understand, make our own, nay, sympathize with up to a certain point. Let us not take sides too ardently in this old war, lest we lose sight of the reality of the conflict; let us appreciate both contestants and behold in them the representatives of two world-historical ideas in a grand collision, both of which have validity, yet one has greater validity than the other.

Greek spirit so dominates us still that the Orient fares badly on this side of that old battle-line. The greater effort is necessary to assume the attitude of world-judge, which is the standpoint of the World's History.

5. In advance it may be hinted to the reader that he should be on the lookout for the structural elements in the following Books. Manifestly the Fifth and the Sixth Books belong together in one great sweep from revolt against the Persian through defeat of the Greek, back again to vic-

tory at Marathon. Then comes a new and far larger oscillation, from invasion through defeat at Thermopylae to the victorious rise at Salamis and Platea; this is contained in the final Books—Seventh, Eighth, and Ninth. The full development of these structural hints will be given later.

BOOK FIFTH.

The expedition to Scythia has not been without effect upon the Persian. Through that humiliating experience he has learned one thing at least: he can cross into Europe on foot. A bridge of boats can be thrown over the Hellespont as well as over the Bosphorus, over the Strymon as well as over the Danube. The Persian was no sailor. In his native land he was not called upon to grapple with the sea, to master it, to make it subservient to his ends. He had a terror of it, or at least no confidence in it; he distrusted its billowy uncertainty, its infinite movableness. He distrusted likewise its children, those dexterous seamen, the Greeks.

Hence it came that the Aegæan kept him hovering so long around its borders. Here was an element, hostile, unconquerable, or which re-

quired another kind of conquest than his kind; water puts out fire, and the Persian was a fire worshiper. He went like a consuming blaze through Western Asia, but stopped at the border of the sea.

Greek spirit was determined fully as much by the sea as by the land. Persian spirit was first halted, then rolled back, and finally overwhelmed by Greek watermen. The Aegæan is the grand Hellenic wall against the Orient, not only training, but protecting its children. Three lines of relationship to it on the part of the Greeks may be marked out. First, it protected the cities on the coast of Asia Minor, being to them an inlet of sustenance in case of siege by land, as well as a means of escape in case of dire necessity. Secondly, it protected the islands, of which it is full, and which may be regarded as its special progeny. Thirdly, it protected continental Greece, being a mighty wall of water manned with floating defenders, whom the enemy could not reach by land. Truly it may be said that without the Aegæan, Europe and its civilization could not have been; both would have been consumed in that Asiatic prairie-fire which was sweeping westward over the world just at the budding of Hellas.

But the Persian has now learned of the path round the Aegæan; he can pass into Europe on foot by bridging a narrow strait. Such is the

grand point at present gained, which will lead to the expedition of Xerxes. The king will not have to trust that fickle, treacherous element of water, or but slightly trust it; at least, it will not be his chief reliance, nor will its children, unsteady like itself, be his main help for reaching the new realm of conquest.

Still, we may here premise, the sea will vindicate itself against the Persian, will not be circumvented by him, but will overwhelm him with its waters, with its winds and rocks, and finally through the skill and strength of its children. The path round the Aegæan is not the subjection of the Aegæan by any means, and, after all, the Persian will be found to have made his journey afoot to Greece in vain. Salamis strikes the keynote, he cannot subjugate the sea even if he does the land; the watery wall cannot be surmounted, this time at least, by the Oriental.

The Persian has, however, discovered the way round, and is going to make the most of it. He follows on the track of the old Aryan migration into Europe, which must have crossed chiefly at the Bosphorus and Hellespont. For we still have to think that the Aryans, in their early movements, came from Asia into their European abodes, though this view has been stoutly assailed in recent years. The Persian, then, getting into this old road from Asia into Europe, begins to see the path leading toward Hellas.

We are now to witness the preliminary fluctuations of the great conflict. The Persian will first seek to remove the obstacles northward in his road round the Aegaeon, wherein he will easily succeed. Then will come a great reaction against him in the south, on the part of the people of the sea, who revolt, quite along the entire border between Asia and Europe. But these Asiatic Greeks will be put down, they are not the true bearers of the new world-idea. Meanwhile, however, its real representative is brought to light in the throes of the struggle.

The sweep of the Fifth Book will be best seen by dividing it into three masses, each of which has its distinct meaning, yet all stand in organic connection with one another.

I. The Persian is occupied in conquering the lands and cities around the Propontis. The barbarous peoples, of which a short account is given, and the Greek settlements in that northern region are put under Persian supremacy. This is the getting and the guarding the road round the Aegaeon for the future (1-27).

II. The longest of the three portions (28-98). A great many matters are introduced, but the setting in which all are placed is the Ionic revolt, or the grand reaction of the Greek-Asiatic cities and islands against Persian rule. More distinctly than before comes out the meaning of the conflict; it is Orient against Occident, absolutism

East
Asia
Asia

Europe
+
Asia

Europe

against freedom; it is the grand protest of the new-born individual in favor of the right of individuality. Sparta and Athens, the future vindicators of this right, appear, not yet as involved combatants, though Athens sends ships, but as interested spectators, standing at present in the background and getting ready to participate in the mightier contest which is certainly coming. Athens, in particular, has its genesis into democracy unfolded, and is shown to be in the process of becoming the true bearer of the new movement, though at present she withdraws from the conflict.

III. The fight rages all along the line of what may be called the Greek-Asiatic border, dividing Orient from Occident, yet at the same time intermingling the two (99-126). From the Hellespont to the island of Cyprus, nearly the full length of the chain of Hellenic colonization to the East, is there an uprising against the hated Persian rule. But it is plain from the start that the revolt is doomed; its leaders are tyrants, and to pass from a Greek to a Persian tyrant, what is the gain? The principle cannot thus be won, and the World's History fights for a principle, though individuals may fight for personal ends. So Athens retires, her time is not yet come; indeed how can she shed her blood for tyrants, the like of whom she has recently expelled?

Such is the general bearing of the Fifth Book, which shows both the movement of Persian power toward continental Greece, as well as the preliminary conflict in the Ionic revolt. We shall now set forth more fully the heads above indicated, following the text of the historian.

I.

Darius, when he returned from his Scythian expedition, left a general in Europe, named Megabazus, who was expressly ordered to conquer both the barbarous nations and the Greek settlements in the Thracian region. The leading object of this conquest has been already stated: it was to get possession of a way by land into Greece and Europe. The Greek town Perinthus was the first one overwhelmed "by numbers," after having shown itself "valorous for liberty." The Persian general then moved his army through Thrace, "subjugating every tribe and every city to the king, for such had been the latter's command."

At this point the historian gives a brief account of the Thracian nation, which he declares to be "the greatest among men except the Indians." Several of the tribes are described in order, among which we may here notice the Getae, usually held to be the ancient Goths, probably the ancestors of the present Teutonic race in part. We can observe in the historian the same tend-

ency, already remarked several times, to lapse into the fabulous, when the extreme portions of the earth are supposed to be reached. "Nobody can say who dwell north of the Ister (Danube), but it seems a desert tract and boundless." Surely a realm for the imagination: "The Thracians say that bees hold possession of those regions, and prevent people from going further," possibly by stinging them with cold. As we have had (see previous Book) a snow storm suggested by the air being full of feathers in the North, why should we not have another quality of such a storm hinted in a swarm of bees? The reader will not leave out of Herodotus this play of mythical fancy, since it is a native ingredient of the work. Of course the Persian general did not seek to penetrate into those distant northern regions again, but kept close to the line of the sea-coast and of civilization.

The Paeonians, one of these Thracian peoples, were in part transported into Asia by command of Darius. Here we come upon a fact very interesting in the light of recent researches: some of these Paeonians were lake-dwellers, "inhabiting the lake" (16). Houses were built on piles over the water, and connected with the land by narrow bridges. Thus a village stands in the middle of the lake, and "the young children have a string tied to the foot to keep them from tumbling into the water." Many lakes in west-

ern Europe show traces of having had similar dwellers, whose piles can often be seen at low water. The Swiss lakes in particular have been carefully investigated, and quite a fund of antiquities and facts brought to light. It is generally supposed that these lake-dwellers were a primitive Turanian people inhabiting Europe before the advent of the earliest Aryans, and were probably driven to dwell in the lake by their advancing enemies. A new Aryan wave of conquest now strikes these most ancient Europeans dwelling in Lake Prasias, but the general Megabazus is not able to conquer them in their pile-buildings (*Pfahlbauten*), though he tried.

The next nation which Megabazus acquires, is the Macedonians, a people semi-Hellenic, and claiming Greek kinship, still they give the symbolic "earth and water" to the Persian ambassadors on demand. The latter, however, grow insolent, and young Alexander (ominous name for Persia) who is son to the Macedonian king, causes the entire seven with their retinue to be slain. One thinks this young prince prognosticates the great Alexander, who, nearly two centuries afterwards, had a final reckoning with Persia.

Thus Megabazus has made a clear path round the Aegæan to the borders of Thessaly. One thing, however, stands in his way and excites his jealousy. Histiaeus, tyrant of Miletus, who

saved the bridge over the Danube, and thereby preserved the king and his army, obtained as a reward from Darius the right of colonizing and fortifying a town near the river Strymon in Thrace, which town stood right in the Persian path toward Hellas. The result is a secret accusation from Megabazus to the king, who evidently gets suspicious and by a stratagem has Histiaeus go to Susa, where he is detained in a kind of honorable captivity. The appeal of Megabazus brings out the ground of suspicion. "O king, what have you done in letting a cunning Greek possess a city in Thrace, where there is plenty of wood for ship-building and for oars, with silver mines and a large crowd of Greeks and Barbarians ready to follow him in any enterprise?" Such was indeed the real danger, a new maritime power was about to spring up on the line of the Persian march.

Darius removed Megabazus also, and appointed Otanes in his place; there was evidently trouble between the Greek tyrant and the Persian general; so both are sent out of Thrace and Asia Minor. Otanes, the new general, pursues the same policy in the North; he takes various Greek cities, and also the islands, Lemnos and Imbros. Indeed the plan seems to be to reduce all those Greek islands of the Aegæan which have not yet acknowledged Persian authority. The group known as the Cyclades have not yet submitted;

the largest of the group, Naxos, is first to be attacked. But herewith is coupled a wholly new turn in affairs, which leads to the Ionic revolt.

II.

The king had two, and sometimes three sets of agents in the maritime districts of Asia Minor: the satrap, always a Persian; the tyrant, always a Greek in a Greek city; the military commander, usually a Persian. The matter was further complicated by two satraps, whose authority extended to the coast; one had his seat of government at Sardes, the other at Dascyleium. The result was frequent conflict of authority between these various officials, as well as jealousies and much underhand plotting and counter-plotting.

In general the Persian would be apt to distrust the Greek, whereof an instance has already been seen in the case of Histiaeus. At the same time the Greek would not fail to have a high opinion of his services in the cause of the king. Did not the Greek tyrants save the Persian monarch and his army at the bridge over the Danube? Did not Greek architects make the two bridges, and Greek sailors man the ships in that expedition, of which the unsuccessful part was the Persian part? There was a good deal in the Scythian campaign

to inspire the Greek tyrant with a lofty notion of his importance and power, and that Greek tongue of his would not fail to let the matter be known. Many shortcomings have been charged upon the Greeks all the way down the ages, but nobody has ever accused them of failing to blow their own trumpet. We can well imagine that Greek vainglory and boasting were not wanting to Histiaeus, and roused both suspicion and hate against him in the breast of the Persian authorities. When hereafter he falls into the hands of a satrap, the latter will put him to death on the spot, without waiting for orders from the king, who would out of gratitude have pardoned him, if he had been spared, and even have consulted him on Greek affairs.

A new name is now introduced (30), which dominates the present Book: it is that of Aristagoras, successor to Histiaeus in the tyranny of Miletus, also the latter's son-in-law and cousin. Aristagoras well knew the Persian's desire of getting possession of the Cyclades, a very important station in the way across the sea to Greece.

An opportunity of seizing Naxos, the largest and richest island of the group, presented itself; the tyrant at once communicated with the satrap Artaphernes at Sardes, who eagerly entered into the scheme, which was also indorsed by the king.

A special general was appointed by the satrap

for this expedition; he was a Persian of the royal family, by the name of Megabates. Thus the Greek tyrant and the Persian general are brought together, with no clearly defined subordination of one to the other apparently; the result is a clash of authority at the very start. Aristagoras releases a friend of his, captain of a Myndian ship, from a punishment inflicted by Megabates on account of a breach of discipline. The two, the general and the tyrant, come to high words about the matter; the latter says with a strong assumption of authority: "Did not Artaphernes send you to obey me, and to sail wheresoever I shall command?" Here we see the difficulty set forth, a difficulty which is at present common in Asia Minor and the Islands.

The Naxians are forewarned by the Persian general, the expedition fails, Aristagoras begins to meditate revolt. Also a message comes from Histiaeus (pricked on the head of a slave in order to escape detection) urging the same measure. Aristagoras called together his partisans and consulted; all concurred except one, Hecataeus the historian, who saw no hope of success in rebelling against Persia. The outcome will show that he was right; Miletus was not the city, nor was its tyrant the man, to head a great movement against Oriental supremacy.

Still we must give the credit to Aristagoras that he saw what the conflict meant, and that he

comprehended the spirit of the time. The world-idea fermenting thus early in those Greek communities was that of democracy. A revolt from Persia could only mean a revolt from one-man power, it would be utterly senseless to pass from a Persian to a Greek tyrant. Hence Aristagoras laid down his own tyranny at Miletus and "established equality before the law (*isonomia*), in order that the Milesians might be willing to sustain him." Then he drove out other tyrants from the cities of Ionia; he even laid a trap and caught a lot of them together in the Persian fleet. These he handed over to their respective cities, "wishing to do these cities a great favor." Thus Aristagoras, feeling the pulse-beat of the time, acted, and brought about a tremendous upheaval; the movement, as we shall see, spread along the entire Greek-Asiatic line, from the Euxine to Cyprus. Such was the response of the popular heart against the Oriental and the Greek tyrant.

But the most significant act of Aristagoras is his visit to Sparta and Athens, both belonging to European Greece, both tyrant-haters, yet each very different from the other. The historian will seize the opportunity to unfold this difference which has already repeatedly appeared in previous Books. These two cities are really the object of Persian attack; they are the grand enemies of the Persian principle. Specially is this the case with Athens.

Sparta. When Aristagoras reached Sparta, it was under the rule of Cleomenes, who was of the senior or Eurysthenid line of Spartan sovereigns. The father of Cleomenes had two sets of children, from two different wives; strong is the contrast drawn by the historian between them. Cleomenes was not of sound mind, still he was made ruler in accord with rigid Spartan custom; while Dorieus, born of a different mother, yet legitimate, "was the first of the young men of his age." Still there was little chance of the best man obtaining the sovereignty at Sparta; so the moon-calf was made king when the worthiest was at hand and in royal line of succession. Such is one marked difference from Athens, where the men who can do the work step to the front and give command.

Aristagoras in his speech first appeals to that idea of freedom, which is now the common bond of all Greece, and which the Spartans as the head of the Greeks ought to vindicate against Persia. "I adjure you, by the Greek Gods, rescue the Ionians from slavery, who are of your own blood." Then the speaker spoke of the wealth of the barbarians, playing upon Spartan cupidity. Finally he produced a map, pointing out on it the many nations along the road to Susa, the Persian capital. This map is a most interesting fact, suggesting the intellectual life of those Asiatic Greeks. The first map is said to have

been made by the Ionic philosopher Anaximander, and to have been used before the time of Herodotus by the historian Hecataeus. The earth was conceived as a plane, and this led more easily to making a picture of it on a plane surface.

One unfortunate answer ruined the prospects of Aristagoras with the Spartan king. The latter asked, how many days' journey from the coast of Ionia to Susa? Aristagoras answered, a three months' journey. That was enough; at once the order came: "Milesian guest, depart from Sparta before sunset." The thought of going such a distance from home was revolting to the Spartan, the least enterprising and aspiring of the Greeks. Herodotus, the traveler, evidently has his furtive laugh in this passage. Aristagoras with his map and with his boundless ideas was curtly dismissed by Cleomenes; his final attempt at bribery was also thwarted.

In these outlines we catch something of the Spartan character, its backwardness, its ignorance, its fixedness in its own limits. To be sure, Cleomenes is a little crazy, still he is a genuine Spartan, crystallized in the rigid Lycurgean discipline, unable to leave his native rocks. Now we pass to a city of quite the opposite character, to which Aristagoras next betakes himself.

Athens. This may be called the new Athens, for she had been reborn after the expulsion of

her tyrants, the Pisistratidae. The spirit begotten of that conflict has roused every dormant energy, and revealed her as the true leader in the approaching struggle with Persia. That new form of government of hers — democracy — is the first great breaking away from the paternalism of the Orient, and is the most important manifestation in Greek political history. She started that unfolding of the people's rule, not by any means ended yet. Athens is the typical Greek city, most Greek of the Greeks; without Athens the rest of the Greeks would be little known and of little account. Here, then, democracy had its birth, and here are the fires at which it is always kindled afresh. In this sketch of Herodotus (55-97) is contained the unfolding of democratic Athens, its movement from a tyranny to a popular form of government. Note also that Sparta is, to a large extent, the unintentional instrument of this movement.

1. The first thing here recounted is the Athenian movement against the tyrant Hippias. His brother Hipparchus is slain by Harmodius and Aristogeiton, the glorified tyrannicides in the eyes of the Athenian people, long celebrated in story, song, and plastic art. The historian gives quite a full account of these two youths as regards their ancestry, stating that they were descended from Phoenicians "who came with Cadmus." It is one of the strange omissions in

this history of Herodotus, that he has so little to say of this important people. But here is a notable paragraph: "These Phoenicians introduced among the Greeks many other kinds of useful knowledge, particularly letters."

Far more important was the influence of the Alcmaeonidae in banishing the tyrant of Athens. They built the temple of Delphi when it had been burned, and they were the chief influence which caused the Lacedemonians to make an expedition against him, the Oracle always bidding them liberate Athens. The first time the attempt failed, but the second time Hippias was expelled, with the help of Cleomenes the Spartan king, who is thus an unwitting means of Athenian freedom.

2. The rise of the Athenian democracy at once begins, under the leadership of Clisthenes, who, however, has a long conflict with a rival, Isagoras. The Spartans wish to undo their work, and their king makes two expeditions, but he is at last foiled. No doubt this Spartan opposition solidified and intensified the democratic spirit. Once in their desperation the Athenians sent an embassy and offered to make an alliance with the Persian, but the latter demanded "earth and water," that is, submission, which the Athenians could not grant, having just gotten rid of one tyrant.

Many small troubles Athens has with her

neighbors — Boeotians, Chalcideans, Eginetans— whereof the historian has thought best to give a good many details. They all show the city growing strong, getting trained, preparing for a great fulfillment of its destiny.

Finally Sparta returns and tries a third time to thwart the realization of Athenian greatness, actually proposing to restore the tyrant Hippias, who is brought from the Hellespont for this purpose. It is curious to see how Sparta has a presentiment of what is coming, and seeks to suppress in advance its future rival. But such a proceeding benefited rather than injured Athens, it was so entirely antagonistic to the Greek feeling of the time. Sosicles the Corinthian voices the latter, making a speech (92) against tyrants, which wins the applause of the assembled confederates. Thus the enterprise goes to pieces of itself and Hippias returns to his town on the Hellespont (Sigeium).

In such fashion Sparta sought to undo her action in expelling the Athenian tyrant. But her whole conduct has only developed and strengthened the democracy which she sought to destroy. From the beginning she is made the unconscious instrument of the development of Athens. The rule of the people has become established, Sparta has compelled it to work. The petty conflicts with the neighbors have schooled the citizens and brought out their latent power. Well does

Athens deserve the enthusiastic comment of the historian: "The Athenians, accordingly, increased in power, and freedom shows, not in one instance only but in every way, what an excellent thing it is; for the Athenians, when governed by tyrants, were superior in war to none of their neighbors, but when freed of the tyrant became by far the first * * * since each man was eager to labor in his own cause" (78). Such is the grand new incentive to the individual; his government is now for himself and by himself.

To this Athens, as hereinbefore described, Aristagoras comes to ask for help, after being driven away from Sparta. He told again what he had already declared to Cleomenes, illustrating with his map; he must have found in every way a more intelligent audience. He moreover added that Miletus was a colony of Athens; kinship roused sympathy. Aristagoras won his point; the comment of the historian upon this fact is peculiar: "It seems to be easier to hoodwink many men than one, if Aristagoras was not able to deceive Cleomenes, a single Spartan, but to delude thirty thousand Athenians." The truth is, however, that the Athenians were not hoodwinked, they felt deeply the approaching contest with Asia, which the stolid Spartan did not; the whole transaction shows that they were keenly alive to the great problem of the time, and were ready to meet it in advance. Accordingly they

sent twenty triremes to Asia Minor, to aid the revolters, in what they deemed very justly to be their own cause.

The fact, however, will have to be confessed that Aristagoras is not the man and the Milesians not the people to be the representatives of Hellas against Persia, of Occident against Orient. We observe that Aristagoras has not really laid aside his absolute power, he still does as he pleases in administering affairs, he shows no trace of accountability to his city or people. On the other hand, the Milesians never won their freedom by expelling their tyrant, as did the Athenians; they never wrought out for themselves their democracy; the result is they have it not, or have a little of it, at the grace of their tyrant. Now it is probably for this reason that the Athenians, as soon as they found out the truth of the situation, quietly abandoned the revolters and sailed home. Not a very noble or devoted act assuredly, still a prudential one; Miletus cannot win, or if she should win with Histiaeus or even with Aristagoras, where would be the gain?

Looking back through this history, we observe that it is the third time that the question has arisen, who shall be the bearer of the Greek world against the Oriental? First was Croesus, himself an Asiatic, though partially Hellenized; also an absolute monarch, quite as much as Cyrus, who overthrew him (Book I). Then

Samos with its Greek tyrant Polycrates comes between Greece and Persia (Book III), but is swallowed by the latter, since it belongs there. The third is now Aristagoras, who gave up, in appearance at least, his tyrannical power, and placed himself at the head of Greek democratic aspiration, something which Polycrates did not pretend to do. A gradation we may see in these three events, a movement of the spirit of the time which is seeking to find or to develop its true representative. All the indications are pointing toward the Athenians as the people most fully imbued with the underlying principle of the age, and most responsive to its call.

III.

The last portion of the Book is devoted to the war; the entire Greek-Asiatic border is ablaze (99-126). Sardes, the residence of the Persian satrap, is burnt, then the Ionians retreat to their ships. The island of Cyprus, always a meeting ground between the East and West, was divided within itself, but its Greek inhabitants especially joined the revolt. Note that it is "the tyrants of Cyprus," who wish to be free, that is, to be free of the Persian tyrant (109). Such an expression indicates the character of the conflict as well as the fundamental reason why it cannot succeed.

So the war rages along the line — Cyprus, Caria, Caunus, Miletus, up to the Hellespont and Byzantium. After the first shock of the revolt, the Persians rally and gradually get the better, though they meet once with a heavy repulse at the hands of the Carians. Plainly this battle-line is drawn in the wrong place for the Greeks, being in Asia essentially. But what is more to their detriment, the new idea is not pure among the revolters; their leaders are tyrants, who, if victorious, will seize or keep the government, and nothing will be settled.

Typical of the whole outcome is the fate of Aristagoras who is the representative man in this revolt. He gave up the cause and fled to Thrace, “having intrusted Miletus to Pythagoras, a citizen of distinction,” in which statement we see that he was practically still the one-man power in Miletus. In his new enterprise he and all who were with him perished at the hands of the Thracians, one of whose cities he was besieging.

Histiaeus, the former tyrant of Miletus, has also appeared in Asia Minor, being sent down by the king from Susa to reconcile matters. He turns out a common freebooter, worse than Aristagoras, who at least recognized the new idea and partially affiliated himself with it, doubtless for his own personal ends, and so it could not take him as its true representative. But Histiaeus,

while he advised the revolt, was wholly adverse to its democratic tendency ; this the Milesians knew and shut him out of their city. He must have strongly disapproved of the policy of Aristagoras ; his evident object was to construct a powerful Greek tyranny as a counterpoise to the Persian. The fate of such a person in such a crisis is again typical ; he fell into the hands of the Persians, where he belonged, and the satrap put him at once to death. He was not Persian, not Greek, really an enemy to both ; and he was rejected by both. On the whole, the reader will have more respect for Aristagoras than for Histiaeus, but will see in the destinies of both a true nemesis of their deeds.

BOOK SIXTH.

This Book is very closely related to the preceding one, it is, in fact, the direct continuation thereof in a number of ways. Both have one theme essentially: the struggle of the non-continental Greeks of the East against Persia, and their failure. That is, the Greek world, except Sparta and Athens with their immediate allies (the Greek colonies of the West are out of the way), is overwhelmed and subjected to the Orient. The Persian line is reasserted in Asia Minor and advanced to the islands of the Egean. The Asiatic Greeks, headed by Miletus and her tyrants, cannot make themselves the successful bearers of the great world-historical conflict. Nor have the Islanders the stuff in them for such a deed; they surrender their freedom; even Egina, at the very door of Athens, sends earth and water to the Great King.

Still the most emphatic point in the present Book is, that the Persian begins to find his limit in the Greek race. He impinges upon the European continent, aiming a blow at Athens; the response of the Athenians is Marathon, veritably the most important battle yet fought upon the face of this planet, as far as mortal eye can see into the meaning of events. This is, therefore the Marathonian Book, recording really all that we know of that epoch-bearing occurrence, and giving it in the order of circumstances which brought it about. It is the first bound put upon Persia by a civilized country; she had swept around her borders and found her limit in barbarous lands, such as Scythia and Libya. But this is a new kind of limit, that between Asia and Europe, Orient and Occident. Marathon is the birth of a new world, specially as distinguished from the East. Premonitions of such a birth we find, indeed, long before Marathon, even in the *Iliad*; but now it comes to light as the historic fact.

In structure the present Book is much like the preceding one, is essentially a repetition of the same — wherein we may again remark that these two Books have the appearance of being halves of one large Book. There are three main divisions:—

I. The Persian Thread, showing the Persian conquering the outlying Greeks, putting down the revolt and subjugating the Islanders (1–47).

II. The Greek Thread, continuing from the preceding Book the history of the continental Greeks — specially Sparta and Athens, each of which is tested by Darius “with earth and water” (48–93).

III. The conflict — the line of battle being removed to continental Greece at Marathon, together with events at Athens succeeding the battle (94–140).

The sweep of the Book has in it a grand upward movement from defeat to victory, from a race's sorrow and despair to a new joy and hope. All Hellas must have shared deeply in this feeling, in this rise from despondency to exultation. But the whole movement took place historically within the Ionic tribe, though a few Dorians and a few more Aeolians were directly involved. The Ionians of Asia Minor and of the Islands were the subjugated ones chiefly, and felt the brunt of Persian vengeance for the revolt; these, too, were the ones who disgraced themselves by their conduct in the sea-fight, the grand crisis. But the Athenians were also Ionic, and to their credit and to theirs alone stands the deed of Marathon. Thus both the fall and the rise in the present Book belong to the Ionic stock.

Once more we may contrast this sweep with that of the preceding Book. There we find the course of Persian conquest interrupted by the

Ionic revolt, which at first was successful, giving freedom to many Greek cities, holding at bay the Persian for a time, and destroying Sardes, a satrap's capital. Such was the sudden outburst of victory which, however, soon began to turn to defeat; the new-born hope of Hellas sank down into despair, as the Persian supremacy reasserted itself, and the Book ends in gloom. Thus the two Books together show a descent and an ascent, a sweep down and up again, rising at last to the dizzy height of Marathon.

I.

We call this first portion of the Book the Persian Thread, since Persia is the determining principle, though Greeks (of Asia Minor and the Islands) are involved and give the historian occasion for a number of amplifications. It shows the complete conquest of the revolt together with some additional conquests on land and sea. The struggle for the supremacy over the Aegæan is decided in favor of Persia; a narrow strip along continental Greece is all that remains free. Thus the marine element is almost wholly, though not quite, subjected — that element to which Greece owed so much of her independence.

We have already noted the insufficiency of the leaders and of the peoples engaged in the Ionic revolt. They did not, and indeed could not, rep-

resent the vital principle at stake between Hellas and Persia; they stood for neither side in its purity; they were but another batch of those intermediate contestants who had to be gotten out of the way before the real protagonists stepped forth into the arena. This fact is now made manifest in its completeness by the conquest of the whole Greco-Asiatic line through Persia, as well as by the Persian preparation to advance to the new line, the Greco-European (1-47).

The Persian suppression of the Ionic revolt may next be noted in its main stages.

1. *Histiaeus*. The account is introduced by bringing before the reader this former Greek tyrant, who has just arrived at Sardes from Persia. His case is typical; he is really the instigator of the revolt, though he pretends to know nothing about it; he is the wily, intriguing Asiatic Greek, double-faced, yet with activity and ability. He is playing his two-sided game now, but he has been found out by the Persian satrap Artaphernes, who tells him to his face: "You stitched the shoe, Aristagoras put it on." Thus Histiaeus is rejected by the Persian; it is no wonder that he takes to flight and goes over to the Ionians.

A number of adventures he has (2-4), all of them characterized by successful lying and slippery cunning; he dances visions of conquest

before the Ionians, and even in his absence he succeeds in turning Sardes upside down and making the hostile satrap's court a scene of confusion and blood. Then he makes an attempt to return to Miletus, which, however, "having got rid of Aristagoras, did not want another tyrant;" so he is repelled from his own city after receiving a wound. Next he turns corsair, taking station at Byzantium and capturing every ship that came out of the Euxine, unless it submitted to him. Thus Histiaeus is cast off by both sides, Persian and Greek, and becomes a common enemy, buccaneer, yet for himself still.

His end may be given here, though it is narrated later (26-30). After the defeat of the Ionians in the sea-fight, he thinks he has a chance in the general hubbub, and so comes down from his perch, seizing the weakened Chians and attacking Thasos. But at last he is taken prisoner by the Persians, is brought to his arch-enemy Artaphernes, and is impaled on the spot, his head being embalmed and sent as a present to his friend Darius at Susa — a grim piece of humor on the part of the satrap.

We have already expressed the opinion that Histiaeus is a typical man of the present Ionic revolt; he is a tyrant, yet turns against the Persian tyrant, when the latter no longer subserves his purpose. He does not intend to establish a free Hellas, but his own tyranny; really

he is neither for Greece nor for Persia, but for himself. Yet he is representative; his success in winning over so many of the Greek islanders, after his flight from Sardes, shows how much they resembled him. Though personally rejected by his own city, it is too like him to win in the present conflict. Not only his character but also his fate is typical: he perishes at the hands of the Persians, which is also the destiny of this Ionic revolt. We may, therefore, see why the historian, with his Greek artistic instinct, opens the Book with Histiaeus, as a kind of overture or prefigurement of what is to follow.

2. *The sea-fight off Miletus and its consequences.* The Asiatic Greeks seem to have quite given up the attempt of defending the mainland against the Persian, though Miletus and some other cities on the coast had not yet been taken. The great struggle is to be a naval battle, very properly too, since the question now is, Shall the Aegaeon become a Persian sea? The roll of States furnishing ships is called, it is a patriotic deed forever to be remembered by all Greeks. The Persian generals, with almost double the number of vessels, are nevertheless afraid of defeat; so they employ intrigue also, with effect, as we shall see.

But, in that fleet the hero appears in full splendor, Dionysius, the Phocaeon. He sees the lack of discipline, he also sees the certainty of

victory, if only the fleet, made up of contingents from many different States with many different heads, be gotten well in hand and be subjected to training. He is chosen leader and practices the ships in maneuvering; for seven days the Ionians hold out, then they break to pieces, refuse to obey and take to the shade instead of toiling in the hot sun. They are unwilling to sacrifice their Asiatic ease, they prefer submission to hardship, they are unfit to be the defenders of freedom. A Militades has appeared among those Ionians, but he has no Athenian spirit to back him; the outcome is signified clearly in this incident.

The historian has duly recorded the degree of merit and demerit belonging to the different contingents. He clearly regards the behavior of the Samians as the worst, they started the stampede, though eleven of their ships stayed and fought with honor. The Chians, however, were the true heroes of the battle, remaining when the rest had fled, and fighting to the bitter end. Herodotus speaks of their many calamities with deep sympathy; this was indeed a tragic time for unfortunate Chios. The schoolmaster will note with interest the school house in the city of Chios, with its one hundred and twenty boys learning to read; evidently public schools were already in existence before 500 B. C., and were well attended, in these Greek islands (27).

Herodotus speaks of the Ionians in a tone of disparagement when he describes this sea-fight; a touch of Doric feeling or prejudice makes itself felt in his words. For the heroic Chians were Ionic, while the Lesbians, who were Aeolians, behaved badly too; in fact they were in some respects the worst of the lot, since they were the chief supporters of the freebooter Histiaeus, and attacked the Chians when the latter were disabled by their sacrifices for the common cause in the sea-fight — a most dastardly act. Then the hero looming up over all is an Ionian, Dionysius, the Phocaeon, whose city has already been celebrated for its heroic resolution in the first Persian invasion (Book I, 164-6). At that time a large portion of the city quit Asia, “detesting slavery;” the remnant that stayed can now furnish only three ships, but it shows still the old spirit.

The part of Samos in the sea-fight with its consequences is given more fully by the historian than that of any other State or city; evidently he obtained his materials for this period through his connection with the Samians, which has been already set forth (Book III). He says as much good of them as he can in honor; he reports their bad conduct in the battle, but tells also the circumstances which may mitigate the ill opinion of the reader. The best Samians did not approve of the action of their generals, and resolve to

migrate rather than live "as slaves under the Mede and the tyrant Aeaces." So they go to Sicily, where they get possession of Zancle, the city which had invited them to a new home, in a manner cunning but not very honorable. Full of treasons, stratagems, and spoils are these Greeks, all of them; note too, the comment of the historian upon this successful act of treachery: "Thus the Samians, being freed from the Medes, gained without toil the very beautiful city of Zancle" (Messina). Clearly Herodotus spares a little too much his friends, the Samians; he heard their side, doubtless from participants in the events themselves, since he was born less than twenty years after the Ionic revolt. Still it cannot be said that he defends the Samians, he tells enough for the reader to form a judgment of the case. Evidently in his day they were ashamed of their part in the sea-fight, since all Greece looked back at it through the glory of Marathon and Salamis.

The Persians conquer with ease the Greek cities on the mainland and the islands not far from the coast (31); then they pass to the Chersonese, where the family of Miltiades had sway; of this family the historian now gives an account, since it produced a number of distinguished men (34-41 and 103). The genealogy is a little complicated; there are two by the name of Stesagoras, two by the name of Cimon, and two by

the name of Miltiades. The first Miltiades son of Cypselus was the first Athenian colonizer of the Chersonese, going back to the time of Croesus (say 550 B. C.). The line of Cypselus ceases with him; but the first Stesagoras (see 103) continues the family through marrying the wife of Cypselus and mother of the first Miltiades. The line now runs: Stesagoras I, whose son is Cimon I, exiled by the tyrant Peisistratus and owner of the mares which won three Olympic prizes; the latter's sons are Stesagoras II (killed by the blow of an axe in the hand of an enemy) and Miltiades II (the Great, victor at Marathon) whose son is Cimon II, who paid his father's fine (136). A very distinguished line of men, evidently opponents of the tyrant Pisistratus, tyrant-haters at Athens, yet tyrants themselves in the Chersonese; likewise foes of Persian supremacy; we remember that this Miltiades II had proposed to break down the bridge over the Danube, and leave Darius without escape from the Scythians.

3. *New Persian policy* (42). The war has plainly taught the Persians that they must organize anew their conquered territory if they wish to obtain its greatest value. We read that the satrap Artaphernes established law among the Ionic cities, taking away their privilege of pillaging one another; apparently he forms a central legal tribunal, to which appeal has to be made in case of differences. Before this the cities prob-

ably could avenge their private grievances; if they paid their tribute to Persia, she did not care about their squabbles with one another. A great advance toward stable government is such a measure; a tighter grip, too, is taken on the subject-cities, so that they cannot so easily get up a fresh revolt. Another important measure secured regularity in taxation by a fixed assessment, which, the historian declares, continued till his day. Truly the Persians have learned somewhat by their recent experience, and Artaphernes shows himself a statesman.

But the most surprising change of policy is that instituted by Mardonius, the new general: he deposed the tyrants of the Ionic cities and established democracies, of course under Persian authority. Undoubtedly this was a recognition of the spirit of the time, and a conciliatory step; still the Persians were led to it in part by their experience with Histiaeus and Aristagoras, both of them Greek tyrants and fomenters of the revolt. So the other party, the democratic, was tried, inasmuch as a Greek tyrant was not necessarily a supporter of Persia, though there was an undoubted affinity between the two. One cannot help thinking that in all these measures the wisdom and administrative ability of the Persian officials are shown; they are true followers of Darius, who was the great organizer of the vast, chaotic empire left by Cyrus and disordered by Cambyses.

Herodotus repeatedly marks the activity and zeal of the Phoenicians in this war. There can hardly be a doubt that they hoped, under the Persian, to regain something of their ancient supremacy in the Aegæan, which had been totally annihilated by the Ionians. This was their war, especially as regards its naval aspect; in the later Persian invasion they will be equally zealous. One of the most surprising omissions in the present History is that Herodotus gives no special account of the Phoenicians, whom he must have known well and whose country he visited. Why such an omission? Did he dislike them for the part they took against Greece? Did he, as a Greek, feel a touch of the old commercial rivalry? He introduces them by the way, when his narrative demands it, otherwise he leaves them alone.

The Persian Thread now begins to pass into the Greek Thread (48) specially — to that part of the Greek world which is in European Greece; we may call it Græco-European in contrast to the islanders and Asiatic Greeks.

II.

The Persian king sends heralds to different parts of Greece demanding “earth and water” in token of submission. Many inhabitants of the Greek mainland complied (particularly in

Northern Greece) and all the islanders including Egina, an island close to Athens, not far from the coast and almost a part of the continent. At once Athens seizes the opportunity and makes complaint to Sparta that the Eginetans have betrayed Hellas. With this brief introduction the second portion of the present Book begins, and we pass to the internal affairs of Greece, mainly those of Sparta and Athens (48-93).

In this incident, however, two points may be noticed. The first is that Athens distinctly recognizes the headship of Sparta (hegemony) and at the same time insists that she do the duty belonging to her position. Sparta in turn recognizes the duty and proceeds to its fulfillment. Thus we see a working basis of unity between the two leading States; this headship will be acknowledged by Athens throughout the coming war. The second point is that the continental Greeks have drawn a sort of boundary line; the other islanders out in the Aegæan can give "earth and water" if they choose, but not Egina, which cannot be Persian without making the Saronic Gulf Persian, and jeopardizing Athens as well as the rest of the mainland in the neighborhood.

Upon the drawing of this Greco-European line against the enemy, Sparta and Athens are substantially agreed. Both refuse to give "earth and water" to the Great King, and both destroy

the Persian envoys, both are, therefore, equally offenders — a fact which unites them all the more, when they see the impending punishment. What is the internal condition of these two cities — are they ready? The historian at this point diverges into an account of Sparta and Athens, especially their recent history. In the present Book Sparta receives the most attention, as Athens did in the preceding Book; particularly is the chief defect of the Spartan Constitution (the double kingship) brought out in strong colors.

Sparta (50–86). Cleomenes, one of the Spartan kings, goes to Egina, to seize the guilty ones, who, however, resist, declaring that he was acting not only illegally but corruptly in not bringing the other king with him on such an occasion. Here the Eginetans touch the Spartan difficulty, being incited thereto by Demaratus (the other king), who succeeds in thwarting the enterprise for the present. This striking circumstance leads the historian to tell how the dual authority came to be.

Formerly the Spartans had a single king; one of these early kings died, leaving two sons, Eurysthenes and Procles, twins, both of whom through a stratagem of the mother and through a response of the Delphic Oracle, were made kings, though one line, that of Eurysthenes, was more honored, because he

was held to be the elder of the twins. It is observed that they, though brothers, were always at variance with each other throughout their lives, and that their royal descendants have not failed to keep up the strife. Thus our historian gives a story to account for a very peculiar political arrangement, which has been said to be the only case in all history; the sole nation with two kings ruling over it is declared to be the Spartan. But there are analogous cases; the two Roman consuls have doubtless the same purpose. It is indeed a very simple scheme to split in two the headship, when it gets dangerous, and so turn it against itself. A very primitive political device unquestionably, still a political device in favor of a rude freedom we must regard it; a kind of Limited Monarchy, before the established reign of Law, is this Spartan Monarchy (or Duarchy), in which the Monarch is limited by another Monarch. The device belongs to a period antedating the lawgiver, Lycurgus, who retained it as an old institution, but who sought to correct in part its defect by establishing the Ephors, in whom the unity of the State was restored in a certain degree. Still the two kings had their own privileges and their sphere of authority, whereof Herodotus gives quite a little summary (56-60). Thus the dualism remains in the Spartan commonwealth, which seems unable to cure it or to shake it off; the examples which

follow set forth the trouble in a very significant manner.

Thus one king had thwarted the other in the Eginetan affair; now a new scene is brought before us in the drama of Cleomenes versus Demaratus, which, we recollect, opened already in the previous Book (V. 75) at Eleueis. Cleomenes returns to Sparta determined to get even with his royal counterpart; he trumps up an old story which threw a doubt upon the legitimacy of Demaratus, and finds in Leutyichides, a younger member of the Procleid line, the instrument by which he can oust Demaratus from the royalty. Moreover the Delphic Oracle is brought through corruption to declare that Demaratus is not the son of Ariston. But this is not the end of the matter. The mother of Demaratus is still living; he is determined to find out his origin; he puts her under the most sacred form of oath and demands that she tell the truth. Her answer cannot be called straightforward, it is not satisfactory to Demaratus himself, and he proposes to leave the country. Indeed how could he stay at Sparta with such a tale going the rounds, spiced up with salacious puns (for instance that between Astrabacus the hero and *astrabelates* the donkey-driver) about his paternity? So Demaratus quits Sparta, is pursued, but succeeds in getting to Persia, where he obtains a place high in honor with the king Darius. Hereafter we shall find

him one of the chief advisers of Xerxes in the grand invasion of Greece.

The historian, faithful to his ethical view of the world, does not fail to record the retribution following these acts of successful wrong. Leutychides was afterwards expelled from his country for bribery and died in banishment (71-2); "he paid the penalty to Demaratus," getting back what he gave. Still more terrible was the fate of Cleomenes who literally hacked himself to pieces. All the Greeks set about accounting for the manner of the death of Cleomenes; it is curious to note these different opinions. The Argives say that he died because of his deeds of sacrilege committed during an invasion of Argos: which fact leads the historian to give an account of this invasion at some length (76-83). The Athenians say the act of sacrilege was done at Eleusis during his invasion of Attica. Another view is that he was crazy; still another that he was drunk, having learned to drink "unmixed wine" from certain Scythians who sojourned for a time at the Spartan capital.

In these accounts of the three Spartan kings — Cleomenes, Demaratus and Leutychides — the historian brings impressively before us the results of the two-headed government at Sparta. The best man of the three — and he was not too good — has been dispossessed of his kingship and has been driven to take refuge in Persia. Next

a short account of Athens is interwoven, the counterpart of Sparta.

Athens (85-93). Through the deed of Cleomenes and Leutychides at Egina (the delivering to the Athenians the Eginetan hostages) the history of Sparta laps over and connects with that of Athens. The Spartans, having found out the truth after the death of Cleomenes, resolve to hand their king, Leutychides, over to the Eginetans, who goes with them to Athens and demands the release of the hostages. But the Athenians do not see their way to such an act, saying that two kings had deposited the hostages, and that it would not be right to give them up to one king. Thus the Eginetans, who once refused Cleomenes on the same grounds (50), have their pretext turned back on themselves with effect.

But in the deeper view of the situation, were the Athenians right in detaining the hostages? These were securities that Egina would not go over to the Persian, to whom she had once given "earth and water." Sparta, as head of Hellas, had exacted these hostages, and the original offense of Egina had not, as far as we are aware, been atoned. The danger to all Greece remained, particularly the danger to Athens, who undoubtedly was looking out for herself in the matter, but her interest was also that of total Hellas. Egina, going to Sparta, had succeeded in changing Spartan policy, appealing

probably to the jealousy of Athens existing in that city. Athens, therefore, appears in this affair as the true supporter of the Greek world.

Leutychides, in order to enforce his request, narrates the story of Glaucus, a Spartan who had received a deposit on trust from a Milesian, and then hesitated about returning it when demanded back. This may be called a Moral Tale, intending to enforce some precept of right or duty; it resembles somewhat that of Solon in the First Book, which enforces the doctrine that man cannot be deemed happy till death. A purposed object, stated in the form of an abstract maxim this story has, differing therein from the *Mythus* and the *Fairy Tale*. The *Delphic Oracle* is introduced, necessary to a genuine Spartan story, setting forth the vengeance which comes of perjury. For Glaucus proposed to swear himself free "according to the laws of the Greeks," if the Oracle would permit; that is, to swear falsely, if the God would see him out. Even stronger is the second response of the *Pythia*: to tempt the God to connive at crime is the same as committing the crime, and is punishable with like penalty. "So no descendant of Glaucus survives to this day," no domestic hearth, no ancestral rites are his—a fearful outlook for a Greek. Thus has Leutychides, in spite of his moral violations, turned moralizer, and gives a lecture to the Athenians, who did not

appreciate it, nay, "they did not even listen to it." Who does? Then the Eginetans have not offered any guarantees against "medizing" — which is the real point at issue; so their hostages cannot be given up in such a crisis.

The Eginetans, however, are bent on making trouble, a petty war begins between them and the Athenians (87). They captured in an ambuscade the *Theoris*, the sacred ship of the Athenians, "full of the first people of the city." Then came a reprisal; the Athenians started a revolution in Egina, proposing evidently to democratize the government, which was oligarchical—a policy which could hardly be acceptable to Sparta. The attempt fails in the city, but the chief revolutionist, Nicodromus, with some other Eginetans keep up the warfare from Sunium on the Attic coast. The Eginetans take four Athenian ships in a sea-fight—thus the miserable strife goes on among the Greeks, with Darius at their door.

Still Athens has, on the whole, won the main point. She acknowledges Spartan headship, securing thereby a basis of unity and co-operation against the Persian. A great and worthy act in Athens, who therein subordinates herself to the cause; through it, too, she imposes duties upon Sparta. Egina is held within the European line, the Saronic Gulf does not become Persian, Athens is ready for the battle at Marathon. She shows at this period no such internal troubles as

those of Sparta; her people, through democracy, have developed a mightiness of national spirit, which is still the world's wonder. The test is soon to be made, Darius is coming, no doubt of it, here he is.

III.

We now reach the third portion of the present Book (94-140) which takes up again the conflict between Persia and Greece, and describes a very important stage of it, the Marathonian stage. Darius keeps advancing, incited by the Pisis-tratids, and determined to subdue "those people of Greece who had refused to give him earth and water." That limit put upon Persia is not only the greatest insult, but is the denial of her national principle, which she feels she must defend or perish. The coils keep slowly tightening, the huge constrictor seems on the point of crushing its prey, which now is little Athens.

It is plain that the last battle-line is to be attacked, which line had been established chiefly by Athens when she prevented Egina from becoming a Persian outpost. Very important does this act of hers turn out: the Eginetans remained with the Greeks and fought bravely at Salamis; but if their island had been converted into a Persian naval station, the danger would have been great indeed, and there probably would have been

no battle of Marathon, surely no battle of Salamis. But now the Persians find it the better way to attack the Greco-European line at its very heart — Athens — not by sea but by land. Hippias, the Pisistratid, favors the same method; he had once recovered the city by that route, and he naturally thinks that his luck lies in the old direction. So Egina, by herself almost the equal of Athens at this period, remains quiet in the rear.

The present portion of the Book will show the gradual approach of the Persians, then the fight at Marathon, and finally certain important events at Athens after the battle. The hero, the Greek hero, rises to view victorious in the fight, but tragic at last; Miltiades will be seen on the highest pinnacle of human glory, and then he falls, utterly unable to stand up under his own greatness. The State is saved, but the individual who has saved it goes down; thus through the grand Marathonian jubilation is wrought a dark strain of destiny, tempering its triumph with a deep undertone of tragedy.

1. *The Persian approach.* This is rapidly told, it takes place by land and sea. Certain islands of the Aegæan are first taken; Naxos which had been the scene of Persian failure (see preceding Book) is captured, though many of the inhabitants escape to the mountains. Delos, the sacred island, is spared, in part out of regard for the feelings of the Ionians, large

numbers of whom must have been in the fleet, and in part doubtless out of a Persian reverence for the sun and moon, with which Apollo and Diana, born in Delos according to the legend, were identified. The armament crosses the sea and reaches Eretria in Euboea, a city in close alliance with Athens, to which the latter had sent 4,000 men. But Eretria was betrayed into the hands of the Persians, though the Athenians escape.

The historian tells the names of the traitors, setting a brand on them, which lasted while Greece lasted, putting them into a kind of Inferno for all time. Such he deemed to be his duty as the recorder of the time. Nor does he forget to mention the grand portent, the earthquake at Delos, as the harbinger of the calamities of this calamitous period.

2. *The battle of Marathon.* From Eretria the Persians pass to the plain of Marathon, as it lay most convenient in the direct line of the movement toward Athens. Herodotus seems to imply in addition that it was chosen as being "the most suitable spot in Attica for cavalry;" but the cavalry never appears in the battle, before it or after it, and one may well doubt if it was ever landed in Attica, where there would be an exceedingly small amount of forage for horses, and very little use among the Attic rocks and mountains for that arm of the service. This,

however, is one of the much-disputed points of the battle.

In the description of Herodotus one man is portrayed as the soul of the entire Marathonian struggle from beginning to end — Miltiades, who had been chosen one of the ten generals of the Athenian forces. This choice primarily was made on account of his experience in Persian warfare. We recollect that he commanded a Greek contingent from the Chersonese in the Scythian expedition of Darius, when he proposed to break down the bridge over the Ister; later he had fought against the Persian power and had been dispossessed of his sovereignty in the North. Probably none of the generals had seen so much service, had shown such leadership in war, or knew so well the weak and the strong points of the enemy. Very creditable to the democratic electors of Athens is his selection at such a crisis, though there rested on him the stigma of having been a tyrant in the Chersonese, for which tyranny he had been prosecuted on a capital charge and had escaped (104). But he and his family had been the strongest enemies of the Pisistratids, by whom his father Cimon had been first banished and then slain. His attitude toward Persia was well known on account of his advice at the bridge over the Ister and his later struggles with that power.

It is manifest when the Athenian army took up

its position on the declivity sloping down to the plain of Marathon (doubtless at the modern Vrana), Miltiades with his experienced eye took in the situation at once, and he saw the advantage of fighting then and there. But the ten generals were divided evenly; Miltiades persuaded the Polemarch to give the casting vote by assurances which sound indeed prophetic (109). To a certain extent we can even at this distance of time catch the outline of some of his solid reasons. First was the very disadvantageous, scattered position of the enemy with the swamp in the rear, preventing both retreat and succor, except by a long detour (see for further details, the author's *Walk in Hellas*). Second was the absence of the Persian cavalry, much feared at that time by the Greeks; he could have easily learned from Ionian deserters that it had not yet been brought over the Euripus and was not soon likely to be. Then there were internal reasons: the partisans of Pisistratus were active at Athens and even in the camp. "If we do not fight, I expect some great dissension will shake asunder the minds of the Athenians so that they will *medize*" (yield to the Mede). He waited till his turn came to command; delay was indeed dangerous, but he probably thought he had better take the risk in order to have his authority legal beyond question, as he had already had a strong taste of Athenian prosecution at law.

In regard to the movement of the battle, its outlines can, we think, be distinctly made out, though many details are obscure. The first thing to be considered is the character of the ground, which is the oldest, most authoritative and least contradictory of all documents pertaining to the fight. Anybody walking over the ground and studying its main points will have at once a natural image of the contest rise before him, which will be easily filled out by the written documents. Note, then, the topographical summary: (1) the sea line where the ships were drawn up; (2) the narrow coast of sand on which a part of the Persian army was encamped; (3) the swamp behind this belt of sand, the most important ally of the Greeks; (4) the firm ground beyond the swamp on which the rest of the Persians were encamped.

Now the very object of the Greek charge, made at a run, was to drive these outlying Persians into the swamp. The success was almost complete, only the center suffered a temporary check. Here the picture in the Poekile at Athens, painted during the lifetime of Marathonian soldiers, gives the most striking, and indeed the capital fact of the victory: "the barbarians are seen fleeing and pushing one another into the swamp," as Pausanias describes the picture, they being propelled thereto by the Athenian charge.

The final stage was the battle at the ships, in which the Persians made good their embarkation with some loss to their assailants. The swamp now, in turn, protected the Persians camped along the sand line; the Athenians had to make the detour, and penetrate a narrow passage, defended by enemies who had been fully forewarned. The Persians then set sail for Athens, apparently designing to attack it from a near position on the sea; but the Athenians march home with all speed, and take their station in another precinct of Hercules; the barbarians, however, soon sail off to Asia.

3. *At Athens after the battle (121-140).* A shield had been held up from some high position shortly after the battle, "when the Persians were on board their ships." This was seen by the Greeks also, and was interpreted as a sign given to the Persians by domestic conspirators to come and take possession of the city. At once the Athenians started for home with all speed from Marathon, and the Persian fleet did sail round Sunium and anchor at Phalerum, the port of Athens, but soon left.

At once the question was asked throughout the city: Who put up that shield? Upon the point arose the bitterest dispute between parties, with charges and countercharges. The historian implies that the opinion prevailed that it was a part of a plot of the Alcmaeonids to deliver the city to

the Pisistratids (115). Against such an accusation he takes occasion to make a strong defense of that family, which had been so long distinguished for its hostility to tyrants, and had in reality been the great means of freeing Athens from the rule of the Pisistratids (121). The question was still alive fifty years later, in the time of Pericles who belonged to the family of the Alcmaeonids, and whose political enemies evidently brought this old charge against him and his ancestors. In the defense here made by the historian we may read a defense of his friend Pericles, from whom he may have derived much of the information about the Alcmaeonids which he shows in his history, here and elsewhere.

Another great family of Athens was that of Miltiades, which we may call the Cypselids — Cypselus was its founder but not its ancestor; this was really the wife of Cypselus through her second husband Stesagoras (see 34–36, and the genealogy of the family a few pages back). Both the Cypselids and the Alcmaeonids were great democratic families and furnished for several generations eminent leaders to the Athenian people. They agreed in their opposition to tyranny, but on questions of domestic policy they were opposed to each other. There is no doubt that the family of Miltiades took an enormous stride forward in public esteem through

the events terminating in the battle of Marathon; it overshadowed for the time being the Alcmaeonids, to whom political partisanship ascribed the putting-up of the shield. Moreover the Alcmaeonids had been connected, by ties of blood and marriage, with the Pisistratids — another fact in which suspicion could breed. On the other hand, Miltiades himself had a son who had become a Persian, and who was married to a Persian ^{woman} ~~wife~~ (41). That son could have been at Marathon fighting against his father, though there is no record of the kind; and sons of that son could have been at Salamis with the army of Xerxes. The probability is that no member of either family put up the shield, but some secret partisan of the Pisistratids, who still had a party at Athens.

As the Alcmaeonids were famous throughout Athenian history, a little account of the family may be here set down. It starts with Alcmaeon, who does many favors to the embassy of Croesus, when the latter was consulting the Delphic Oracle (see Book First). This Alcmaeon, according to the tale (125), became rich through being permitted to help himself to gold from the treasury of the Lydian king. His son was Megacles, whose political career in connection with Pisistratus is given in the First Book (61-64). This Megacles was an Athenian suitor for the hand of the daughter of Cleisthenes tyrant of Sicyon (see

the Wooing of Agariste, soon to be recounted). Megacles had two sons — Clisthenes the legislator at Athens (V. 66-70), and Hippocrates (131) whose grandson was Pericles through a daughter Agariste, married to Xanthippus. This same Hippocrates through his son Megacles (second of the name) had a great-grandson in Alcibiades famous in the later history of Athens, after the time of Herodotus.

Such, then, were the two great families now at Athens, both of them producers of illustrious men, both democratic yet both ambitious to rule the democracy, and hence antagonistic to each other — we may call them the Cypselids and the Alcmaeonids. Here the historian interweaves a tale or rather a novelette, which, when we look into it closely, we shall find very suggestive.

4. *The wooers of Agariste* (126-130). Clisthenes, the wealthy and polished tyrant of Sicyon, published throughout Greece a grand contest for his daughter Agariste, wishing to wed her to "the best man of all the Hellenes." The wooers assemble from every part of the land, their names are duly reported in the catalogue; trial was made of "their manly powers, of their temper, of their culture, and of their character;" their genealogy was duly inquired into, and thus the testing went on for a year. Two suitors from Athens were present, who took precedence of all others; one was Megacles son

of Alcmaeon, the other was Hippoclides, son of Tisander, and of the two the latter was the more favored and had already won the maiden or the maiden's father. But on the very day when the marriage was to be decided and publicly announced, Hippoclides began to dance and to dance and to dance, and he ended by standing on his head before the whole company and dancing in that way, with his feet whirling in the air. Clisthenes was shocked and made the announcement; "Son of Tisander you have danced away your marriage." There might have been still hope with due apology, but Hippoclides answered: "Don't care." Therewith his rival Megacles was given the bride, whom the latter carried off to Athens.

This story was undoubtedly founded on fact, yet, we may well suppose, it has some fictitious elements. There is in it a kind of epical imitation, reminding the reader of portions of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*; one cannot help thinking of the suitors of Penelope and of some of the scenes at Ithaca, though in the present case the woman is kept wholly in the background; Agariste herself does not appear and has seemingly nothing to say in the matter. Herein we note a great difference from Homer; there has come over Greece a remarkable change in the position of woman since Homeric times. Yet Herodotus is a chivalrous admirer of the fair sex

and gives them what prominence he can; note Artemesia, Tomyris, and other Eastern queens. Listen also to the following passage of the present Book (122): "This Callias deserves to be remembered everywhere by everybody, * * * especially on account of his conduct toward his daughters, of whom he had three; he gave to each a magnificent dower, and permitted each to marry that man of all the Athenians whom she might choose for herself." Here is the right of choice given to maiden long before Shakespeare and the modern world; truly a far-off anticipation of the girl of to-day. We believe it to be a genuine Herodotean sentiment, and deeply consistent with the historian's character. Still, we feel bound to say that the passage has been suspected by critics, notably by Stein, who holds it to be the work of some later interpolater (see his note *ad loc.*).

But why should the story be inserted here after the battle of Marathon? On looking into the matter, we find that this Hippoclidides who "danced away his marriage," was very probably a member of the great family to which Miltiades belonged, namely the Athenian Cypselids, who were related to the Corinthian Cypselids, Hippoclidides being connected with the latter (128). So this tale brings out two members of these rival Athenian families competing for the fair prize of all Hellas more than two generations

before the battle of Marathon, and reflects not only the character of the persons concerned but the character of the families. The more brilliant Cypselid has already won the precious object, but throws it away when just in his hands through lack of balance, while the more solid Alcmaeonid carries off the bride, the very Helen of the time. The tale will, therefore, suggest Miltiades and in a less degree Xanthippus, who was not an Alcmaeonid by birth but had married into the family; possibly too, it will hint of Cimon and Pericles belonging to the period after the battle of Marathon, which was also the period of our historian. Accordingly we are now to see how Miltiades, having attained unexampled success by his genius, "danced away his marriage," and was put down by his rivals, especially by Xanthippus, father of Pericles.

5. *Fate of Miltiades* (132). After the great defeat of the Persians, "Miltiades, who was previously held in high estimation rose into greater repute than ever." Such is the grand climax of danger for every Greek soul, the danger of success. He asks and obtains of the Athenians ships and money for what must be called a marauding expedition, playing before their imaginations that "he would make them rich if they would follow him." That life of his in the Chersonese, a life of forays on the border, he begins anew from Athens; he assails a Greek island,

Paros, with the view of plunder mainly, and of satisfying an old grudge against a Parian. The expedition was a total failure, the hero of Marathon came back to Athens with his glorious career completely reversed — unsuccessful, unheroic, wounded, dying.

His enemies, led by the Alcmaeonids, have now their opportunity; especially Xanthippus is active in the case, prosecuting him on a capital charge “for deceiving the Athenians,” who, of course, would not have been deceived if the affair had been a success. They show the same character as Miltiades in this business — from Marathon they descend to being freebooters in that very Hellas which they have so gloriously helped to liberate. Both the hero and his people reveal the same limitation.

Miltiades was present at the trial; “lying on a couch with wound mortifying, he did not try to defend himself.” But friends he had who did, citing his services at Marathon, and also in the capture of Lemnos, “which island he having taken, inflicted vengeance on the Pelasgians, and then gave it to the Athenians.” So there was one foray which had been successful, and of which the Athenians received the advantage. With this account the historian connects a notice of the Pelasgians and their deeds in relation to Athens; repeatedly they have come up before in the present narrative — that strangely vanish-

ing tribe of people which so often flits momentarily through the background of Grecian history.

Such, then, was the fate of Miltiades, the Athenian, enemy of tyrants at home, but the tyrant himself abroad, perishing through his own inner contradiction. The family opposed the Pisistratids at Athens, yet subjugated and ruled irresponsibly not only Barbarians but Greeks in the Chersonese. Yet they are not Oriental in sympathy, they are profoundly Athenian and even democratic in their hostility to the Persian autocracy. A new sort of tyrant, yet supremely typical of Athens herself, for she will hereafter be a democracy at home, yet a tyrant abroad and rule "an Athenian Empire" in Hellas itself. Nay, even now, just after Marathon, she has shown herself perfectly willing to subjugate free Greek communities in Paros; truly she is what Miltiades is, her present greatest son, having the same inner limitation and contradiction.

Miltiades is, accordingly, a tragic character, revealing the conflict on the stage of his own soul, which makes tragedy in real life or in the drama. We must not forget that this is the age of Aeschylus, supremely the poet of the tragic view of the world, and that he was himself at the battle of Marathon, of which his brother was one of the heroes. And Athens herself has the same tragic germ in her character, which later will come to maturity, yet is at present foreshadowed

in her deeds and in her literature. Both Athens and her hero lack universality, which is the true salvation from the tragedy of existence; not universal was Miltiades, he loved liberty for Athens, but not for Paros, or for the Chersonese, or for Lemnos, and so he does the tragic act and dies; not universal is Athens, loving her own autonomy and defending it with heroic vigilance and courage, but violating it too often in other Greek cities. But the grand tragedy of Athens is a later chapter of Greek history, not recounted and probably not fully seen by Herodotus.

BOOK SEVENTH.

It has been already noticed that the history of Herodotus as a whole divides itself into two parts, the second part being made up of the last five Books. This second part again falls into two main divisions, the Fifth and Sixth Books constituting one, the Seventh, Eighth, and Ninth the other. These last three Books, then, belong together, giving the culmination of the Greco-Persian conflict, the invasion of Xerxes; a single great drama we may deem it, in three acts, of which the first act shows the Spartan tragedy on land (Thermopylae); the second shows the triumph at sea, essentially Athenian (Salamis); the third act shows the Greek victory on land both in Europe (Platea) and in Asia (Mycale).

We see the entire Orient under Persia getting ready for the war. At Marathon, merely a small

Persian contingent was engaged on the one hand, and on the other merely the Athenians (with the Plateans); but now all the East is consolidated and hurled against Greece, and all the Greeks are summoned to save their world, and must aid or refuse to aid. Both sides are putting forth their full strength; when this has manifested itself, the historian brings his work to a close.

Coming to Book Seventh and inspecting with care its structure, we find it organizing itself naturally into three portions. First is the Mustering of the Orient, showing the internal movement in the mind of the absolute ruler of Xerxes, and the external movement of the Persian armament from Asia into Europe. Second is the Mustering of the Greeks, showing the internal movement toward unity against the Oriental host (along with those Greeks who held aloof from their nation's greatest struggle), and the external movement of their army and navy. Third is the preliminary conflict between the two sides, with the first battle-lines on sea and land, culminating in the fight at Thermopylae.

Such are the three general sweeps of the Book, into which are introduced here and there episodic turns, stories, anecdotes, after the manner of the historian. It is dominantly historical in spirit, yet has its supernatural hints, omens, oracles. The end of the Book is sad, tragic;

Leonidas with his three hundred Spartans and seven hundred Thespians, perish, suggesting the possible tragedy of Hellas, unless there enters some new saving element. This element will be introduced through Athens, and will be shown in the last two Books.

I.

That which we have called the Mustering of the Orient (1-131) is very artfully constructed; into this structural element we must glance again at the start. There are three stages, each of them sharply marked by the introduction of a dialogue in which Xerxes is the central speaker, and in which are imaged the movements of the monarch's mind, as well as, more remotely, the movements of the Persian national spirit. These three stages also occur at important places in the advance toward the great end, Hellas: at home in Persia, at the Asiatic border where the crossing into Europe takes place, in Europe at Doriscus where the enumeration of the hosts is made.

In each of these stages there are two threads, an internal and an external, in due correspondence. The internal thread has as its leading figure and interlocutor the king, Xerxes, in whom and round whom the whole affair moves. We are inducted into his thought, which, he being unlimited sovereign, must rule all. Still he has

his deep misgivings about the enterprise; at first he is not inclined to it, but he cannot hold back, in spite of his absolute power; something drives him forward, a strong necessity in the time, in his people, in the Orient. The external thread follows the internal one, with a further step toward realization.

An outline of these three stages with their corresponding threads we shall set down in the form of a table.

1. The first stage of the Persian Mustering is Asiatic, and takes place in Persia. Darius left the revenge upon the Athenians for Marathon as an inheritance to his son; then certain Greeks at court (the Pisistratidæ, the Aleuadæ, Demaratus) were urging the war against their countrymen. But these causes were merely incidental to the real cause — the inherent conflict between Orient and Occident, now to be imaged in the surgings of the autocratic mind (1-45).

(1) The internal Thread is the movement in the mind of Xerxes (a mustering of his purpose) given most completely in his speech and in that of Mardonius for the war and in that of Artabanus against it. All opposition is overborne, and war is resolved on (8-18). The first chapters (1-7) are introductory.

(2) The external Thread is the mustering of the armament by land and by sea, and the march to Abydus on the Asiatic border (19-45).

2. The second stage is the crossing from Asia into Europe — the Orient seeks to get possession of the Occident (46-100).

(1) The internal Thread; Xerxes is in tears at the limit of life, which is death; but Artabanus admonishes him of other limits during life, probably soon to be felt by the unlimited ruler, and is sent home (46-53). Marked increase of the king's fatuity.

(2) The external Thread; the army crosses the bridges over the Hellespont "under the lash;" the muster-roll of the army and navy (54-100).

3. The third stage shows Xerxes in Europe, after the enumeration and review of the grand armament. He has crossed the border, the territorial limit with all the Persian Orient; can there be any successful resistance to such a force? (101-131.)

(1) The internal Thread; Demaratus the Spartan is now called to give answer; yes, there will be resistance to the death. Xerxes laughs at him, but lets him go, manifesting the blindest confidence in his masses (101-104). Thus, the monarch, as he moves onward out of Asia into Europe, is shown moving more and more into infatuation, into a belief in his own unlimited self.

(2) The external thread; the army passes from Doriscus toward Greece, sweeping along with it all the nations on its path (105-131).

Such is the movement of Persia into Europe, once again crossing its western limit with a large army, as previously Darius had done. More than ever before the historian has sought to set forth the Persian consciousness, specially as it shows itself in the king, the unit of that consciousness. From the one center everything moves, the vast array is put in motion by one will, the stress is upon unity. Others may advise, but the king can choose his advice, he follows what he pleases. No independent individuality but his; what a contrast to the Greek!

From this point of view we can see the historian's method of handling his subject. It is Homeric, and Xerxes is the Zeus of his Iliad, which is the culmination of the Persiad; he is the supreme governing power of the world. Yet there are inferior Gods who converse with him, honestly telling him their opinion. So Xerxes has his Mardonius, Artabanus, Demaratus, lesser lights circling around him, yet controlled by him. In like manner Homer has his Upper World of deities moving the lower world of mortals before Troy; is not the grand expedition directed from the Persian court with its central Ego? The whole manner of Herodotus in this part is epical, a reproduction of Homer in History; there is a thread which is dialogue, the dialogue of the Gods, giving the internal or spiritual principle at work; then there is the thread of outer

events, the manifestation of this principle in the world.

Moreover there can be no doubt but that the dialogic portions, the conversations of Xerxes with those around him, are fictitious, composed by the historian himself giving free rein to his creative power. It is only another phase of his mythical gift, which we have already so often noticed. Still, though the outer form be fictitious, the essence is truth, in fact just the truth of the whole Greco-Persian conflict. As Aristotle, another Greek, has said: poetry is truer than history. But when the expedition itself is treated, the narrative becomes historical, dropping from poetry into prose, from fiction into fact. The above scheme we shall now develop in detail.

1. The first stage of the Persian movement is the Asiatic, that is, it takes place in Asia, and shows the advance toward Europe. After the battle of Marathon, Darius was more determined than ever to humble the Greeks of the continent; that limit which they had put upon Persia must be removed. Accordingly "Asia was thrown into excitement for the space of three years, the bravest being enrolled for the expedition against Greece." Asia against Greece is indeed the conflict. A revolt breaking out in Egypt interfered for a time; in the midst of the preparations against both countries, Darius died and was suc-

ceeded by Xerxes, his son by Atossa, daughter of Cyrus.

(1) The new king is the central figure of the present Book. ^{Xerxes} Around his presence the great expedition moves toward its goal; in his mind the fluctuations of the mighty struggle from one side to the other image themselves; our historian seeks to give both these sides swaying through the soul of the monarch, and interweaves them in a subtle web of connection. Xerxes was at first not inclined to make war upon Greece, but the influence in favor of it was too strong for him.

This influence was mainly of two kinds, Greek and Persian. Tyrants who had been driven out of Grecian cities usually betook themselves to Persia, where they constituted quite a little group. The Aleuadae of Thessaly, the Pisistratidae of Athens are mentioned, but the chief of these expatriated Greeks was the Spartan Demaratus, who will be introduced as one of the spokesmen in the drama which follows. Still, the main influence working upon Xerxes was Persian, and was twofold, for and against the invasion.

Mardonius represented the Persian influence which favored the invasion. His leading argument was that Persia must punish the Athenians for Marathon; national honor demanded vengeance. The historian adds that Mardonius had a personal motive also: "he was eager for

new enterprises and wished to be governor of Greece."

And now comes the speech of Xerxes (8), in which the Persian spirit in regard to the war is expressed. "What deeds preceding kings, Cyrus, Cambyses and Darius achieved, I must try to equal." Vengeance upon Athens must be taken. "I intend to bridge the Hellespont, to march an army through Europe against Greece." But the most significant statement is the following: "if we subdue the Greeks, we shall make the Persian land of equal bounds with the air of heaven; nor will the Sun look down upon any territory bordering upon ours; but I shall make them all one land, marching through Europe. Thus both the guilty and the guiltless shall have to submit to the yoke of servitude."

Such is indeed the utterance of Persian consciousness, which can allow no external boundary to be put upon itself. All must acknowledge its supremacy, then they can live. Moreover this consciousness is directly connected with the Sun, which shines upon all, and whose limit is darkness. The religion of the Persians was the religion of light and darkness, whose conflict was their great symbol, the conflict between Ormuzd and Ahriman. The Persian nation was the light, the Sun, and any limitation of it was darkness. So the war between Persia and Greece

according to the
religion

was a conflict between Ormuzd and Ahriman, and must have had a religious meaning.

In this way we may bring before ourselves the deeper ground of Persia's conduct. It was not revenge alone, though that was one motive, not desire for wealth, or for territory merely; the Persian, as the true follower of Ormuzd, had to try to remove the Occidental limit, which meant darkness and extinction to him and to his deity. Persia had to go forth into the fight in order to be Persia. Xerxes at first was averse to the struggle, but there can be no doubt that the spirit of the Persian people pushed him forward. They sought, and it was their spirit to seek, unity, the unity of the world; to be sure this was an external or territorial, and not an internal or spiritual unity. Such is the strong side of their cause, in striking contrast to the Greeks, who have no unity, but the idea of freedom, of individuality.

W.B. The weak side of the Greeks is emphatically brought out by Mardonius in his speech (9). "They are accustomed to undertake wars without deliberation, fighting one another; but they ought, being of the same language, to adjust their differences by means of heralds and messengers, in any way rather by battle." Such is indeed the fatal lack of unity in Greece, and from this comes the danger. But the Persian takes little account of individuals, he believes in vast

masses; he has to learn that one man may be more than a multitude. Unity without freedom is Persian, freedom without unity is Greek. N. 3

Still the Greek side is to find a representative among the Persians — Artabanus, who is now to give his opinion (10). This high-born Persian, brother of Darius and uncle of Xerxes, voices the difficulties of the invasion. He distrusts the bridge of boats over the Hellespont, and recalls the bridge of the same kind over the Danube, at which Darius so narrowly escaped. Then from the action at Marathon he is inclined to draw a deterring inference. But his chief argument is the religious one: “Dost thou not see how the God smites, with his thunderbolt, the overtowering animals, and does not suffer them to grow insolent? So a large army is overwhelmed by a small one; since the deity through envy strikes them, not permitting any one but himself to cherish great thoughts.” N. 3
Thus says Artabanus, through whom the historian is speaking his own opinions, affirming his well-known doctrine of divine envy.

The views here set forth ^{constitute} constitute a kind of a Philosophy of History, as Herodotus had conceived it in relation to the Persian War. What is the ultimate ground of the destruction of such a large force by such a small one? It is carried back to the divinity, who is jealous of the colossal, the enormous, the excessive in any shape.

Truly Greek is the idea of moderation, and the Greek God must bring down in some way this immoderate Asiatic king, army, people. Mere magnitude is undivine, the Giants were hurled into Tartarus by the Olympians in the old Mythus. Such is the principle; again the Hellenic spirit is fighting a Gigantomachia, historical, not mythical. The envy of the God is his hate of the chaotic mass overwhelming the free individual. Artabanus (or Herodotus) is the Greek soul in Persia, having a presentiment of what is to come, uttering the warning of the seer. The Greek God also is a leveler, democratic; he will level the haughty monarch, even the Persian King, highest of mortals.

Xerxes gave an angry, scornful answer to the frank declarations of Artabanus; still the king soon felt similar forebodings, and even changed for a time his resolution to invade Greece. Then came the dream urging him forward again; a specter stood beside him in the night and spoke: "You do not well to change your mind, nor is there any one here in Persia who will approve." The last sentence expresses the meaning of the ghost; the spirit of Persia it is, which appears to him in his unconscious moments and bids him not recede. The same ghost appears soon to Artabanus, threatening "to burn out his eyes with hot irons," if he persists in his advice. So he too yields, concluding that "some divine impulse

has sprung up," and that "some God-sent destruction is on the point of overtaking Greece." Such is the vivid picture of the historian, setting forth the spirit of Persia, in its religion and its national idea, as it works upon the unwilling Xerxes first, then upon the unwilling Artabanus, and forces both out of their opposition into acquiescence. Note here in what way Herodotus employs the dream, conveying a great and important fact in a fictitious or unusual form. A second vision Xerxes has, far less significant than the first; he dreams that he is crowned with a branch of the olive tree, which branch then suddenly vanishes. This dream is evidently made to order, foreshadowing his capture of and flight from Athens, the sacred home of the olive.

Such is the inner movement, that of the mind, of Xerxes, in his fluctuations from unwillingness to resolution. Manifestly the spirit of the Persian nation overbore him in favor of the war, which was a deep necessity of Persian spirit. The latter could not quietly endure the Greek limit and remain itself. It may be here noted that this use of the ghost is very similar to Shakespeare's use of it in his *Julius Caesar*.

(2) Now we pass to the external movement of the king, who starts from his capital, Susa, for Greece to lead in person the expedition. He commands a canal to be cut across the peninsula

of Mount Athos (22), not so much for its utility as out of a feeling of pride, thinks our historian. Also the Hellespont was bridged, stores of provisions were gathered along the proposed route, and the march begins from a city called Critalla in Cappadocia. Xerxes on reaching Sardes, sends heralds to the cities of Greece demanding earth and water, but no heralds were sent to Athens or Sparta.

Several anecdotes illustrate the character of Xerxes. He can be very kind and generous, yet also very cruel and ignoble. As long as no limit is put upon him by man or nature, he is exceedingly gracious. His conduct when a storm broke up the bridge over the Hellespont shows his disposition. He ordered the water to be whipped with a scourge, and a pair of fetters to be let down into the sea. The winds and waves refused to obey him, so he rises in wrath against the limit they place to his power.

Xerxes leaves Sardes in 480 B. C., and passes towards Abydus on the Hellespont. On the way he goes through the plain of Troy, and visits the Trojan citadel. He learns of the famous war once waged on this plain, where the great battle between Orient and Occident was first fought. He must have felt some tie connecting him and his expedition with the place; he sacrifices a thousand oxen to Trojan Minerva, and the Magi pour out libations to the heroes, the Trojan ones

doubtless. Terror fell upon the camp in the night during these ceremonies; Greek heroes also haunted the locality probably. Famous Scamander was drunk dry by this army. The Asiatic boundary is reached at Abydus, the king is now to leave his Orient and to pass into Europe. But first he takes a survey of his forces (44) on both sea and land. "And when he saw the whole Hellespont covered by the ships and all the shores and plains of Abydus full of men, Xerxes thereupon pronounced himself happy, but afterward shed tears." The proud monarch, in the height of his glory, shows the finite man, and feels the transitoriness of himself and of all his host: "In a hundred years hence not one of them will be alive."

2. Here we have reached the second stage of this movement of Xerxes, inner and outer. He beholds both his naval and military power at the crossing into the new world; he passes over the border line between Orient and Occident.

(1) His internal state is shown by another conversation with Artabanus, whom after all he took with himself on this expedition. Again Artabanus enacts his former part, he is monitor to the young king, holding up before the latter the just limits of power, and calling to mind the difficulties in the way of the present enterprise. The first grand obstacle is the water, an uncertainty and a terror to the Persians, who were not

a sea-faring people; moreover these Ionian sailors are very dubious in their loyalty, being compelled to serve against their own kindred. The second grand obstacle is the land with its dangers and hardships. Thus Artabanus acts as limit-placer upon Xerxes, who is more impatient of restraint than ever; so he sends Artabanus back to Susa, and gets rid of his disagreeable monitor. Herein we may note a step further in arrogance on part of the king, and for the future he has no uncle to warn him. When he passes out of the Asiatic bound into Europe, he has transgressed his limit, both within and without; the Orient is the field for the Persian, it is really a going beyond the bound of Persian spirit to pass out of Asia. But Xerxes is now absolute, without the check of Artabanus.

(2) The passage over the Hellespont is accompanied with significant religious ceremonies, which mark its importance in the eyes of the king. He felt that it was a prodigious step, and very uncertain. The Persian Gods are invoked with prayer; especially the Sun, the deity of Light, is petitioned and placated with sacrifices; the army marches over the bridge from East to West along with the movement of the great luminary.

Now the king is in Europe and skirts the coast of the sea till he comes to Doriscus, which is a shore and plain in Thrace (59). Here the enu-

meration takes place. The muster-roll of the Persian army is given; all the subject-peoples of Asia pass in review before their march against Greece. The land forces are computed at seventeen hundred thousand. The number of triremes is placed at twelve hundred and seven. It is a huge Asiatic mass, not well organized, utterly heterogeneous compared with the Greek, and forced to its task by the whip.

3. When the enumeration was finished, and Xerxes had made a complete inspection of his army and his navy (100), he enters upon the third stage of his movement from Asia to Greece. He calls to himself a Greek now, Demaratus, the Spartan, who is to hold up before the king the character of the Greeks, specially of his countrymen. "Will they fight this vast army?" asks the king. "Certainly; if only a thousand, they will give you battle." The thing seems impossible to Xerxes, who has merely the notion of a vast overwhelming mass, like nature's avalanche; he has no conception of the disciplined army of small numbers. Still less can he see how the free individual can be under authority, and obey without the whip. The statement of Demaratus gives the Greek view: "The Lacedemonians fighting singly are inferior to no men, but fighting together they are the bravest of all men." Such is the result of their military life and training, which organizes the

mass. Again: "they are free but not free in all things; over them Law is master, who always demands the same thing," and thus they are not subjected to the caprice of an absolute monarch. So the Spartans will not flee before any number of men, but will "remain in their ranks, and conquer or die."

The words of Demaratus are a prelude to the war, specially the Spartan prelude to the battle of Thermopylae. This dramatic preparation goes before the real struggle and prefigures the result. Very sharp is the contrast drawn between the Spartan and the Persian ideas, which are about to grapple.

(1) The inner movement of the mind of Xerxes is to be noted in this interview. He again receives a warning, not now from a Persian but from a Greek, a Spartan, who announces the fact which the king may soon expect. But Xerxes cannot accept the view presented; the vast army, now known by the enumeration, has increased his infatuation to the point of blindness; next will come the shock, the blow from the outside, which will verify the words of Demaratus.

Thus Xerxes has passed through three stages, moving more and more toward his fateful condition. Far back in Susa he listened to the warning of Artabanus, but both himself and his monitor were overborne; in Abydos on the border,

where the king first saw his vast army, he dismissed Artabanus; at Doriscus, when he knows the numbers of his host, he will not believe Demaratus, the Spartan telling of the Spartans. The reader will not fail to observe a continuous increase in the fatuity of Xerxes, marked off in three main gradations.

(2) The external movement is resumed from Doriscus toward Greece (105). Our historian has carefully noted the places through which the army passed, along with many incidents of the march. As the wave rolled on, additions were made to it from the nations along its path; many ships were also added to the naval armament. The army marched in three divisions, along three different roads; one moved by the coast, another inland, and one between these two; with the latter Xerxes went. A vast swarm of human grasshoppers devouring everything in its way; it sweeps around the Thermaic Gulf, turns southward through Thessaly, and begins to draw toward the Greek battle-line.

II.

Such is the Persian host mustering and advancing against Greece; what is the latter doing? Next we are to have the mustering of the Greeks and their advance against the invading host (131-178).

Striking is the difference between the two sides, not only in numbers but in character. The Persian army has one will at the center, all other wills are absorbed or unified in that one will. The Greek host has many wills, each self-determining and independent; hence its character is first that of separation, scission, discord. But when it gets united, the union is an internal one, that of the spirit. As their fight is for freedom their union must be essentially a free act on the part of the individual, city, and State. If external force were employed to produce conformity, the Greek army would be like the Persian, whose symbol of unity is the whip. But all the Greeks are not at one, accordingly we are to see how both the hostile and the indifferent elements slough themselves off from the great enterprise.

In this Greek portion both structure and style change in the historian's narrative. In the preceding Persian portion of the present Book there was the internal movement in the mind of the king, and then the external movement of the army, with little volition of its own. But now there are many internal movements, each leader, city and State has its own, and the Oriental oneness seems shivered into an endless Greek multiplicity of individuals which have to get their unity through themselves. That external, rather jejune and mechanical account of the army's march falls away; also the internal movements

of the one ruling will have no place here ; on the contrary, life, struggle in all variety wakens a fresh interest, which is imaged in the style of the historian. Free activity of the man is now at the front, and makes tense every muscle ; the enslaved activity of the Persian portion has imparted itself to the words in which it is told, and the form which the whole account takes on.

These points will be best seen just now by a survey of the structure of this portion of the Seventh Book. Note how it starts with Greek division, not with Persian solidarity ; the Greeks will also come to unity, but not through external might ; those who refuse to unite, however, must take the responsibility of their act. The movement of this Greek portion is, therefore, through the separation and diversity involved in many free-wills to their unity based upon their choice. The form which their problem takes here is, Shall we give earth and water to the Persian, symbols of submission?

1. The first division into two opposites — those who grant and those who defy the Persian demand (132-147).

(1) The list of those who gave earth and water (132) ; quite all of these peoples lie outside of the Greek battle-line, in or toward Thes-saly, and hence exposed helplessly to the Persian. So much for their excuse ; but they had not the stuff of the Athenians, who still kept up the fight

after losing home and country. Yet this excuse does not hold good for the Thebans and Boeotians. The penalty is a tithe to the God at Delphi.

(2) The list of States which not only refused earth and water but destroyed the Persian heralds demanding the same — Athens and Sparta, to which we must add their allies (133-144). This destruction of the heralds was, however, a violation of the Gods (and of the law of nations then beginning to be acknowledged); for which violation the religious Spartans are laid under a divine judgment, while the Athenians did not suffer any penalty for the same offense, in the opinion of the historian (133).

2. The list of the neutrals — the important Greek States which neither submitted to Persia, nor aided Greece. Four such States are specially mentioned, in which we may note two classes, according to locality (148-171).

(1) The central Greek State which stood aloof was Argos. Various reasons assigned for her attitude (148-52).

(2) The remoter Greek States which refused aid — Sicily, Crete, Corcyra (153-71).

3. Now we are to see those who are really united in the defense of Greece taking their position in the line of battle, and thus showing their spirit. The sifting has taken place; the hostile, weak, and indifferent Greeks are sifted

out, probably to the advantage of the cause. Two battle lines and another sifting (172-8).

(1) The first battle-line includes Thessaly, whose peoples have not the grit of the true Greek soul, and cannot stand the test. "If you do not send us an army to guard the pass of Olympus, we shall make terms with the Persian." Not the true ring; so in the end they did go over and "proved most useful to the king." No such backing can help in the long run, so Thessaly must be sifted out (172-4).

(2) The second battle-line at Thermopylae and at Artemisium — the first being the station on land, the second being the station on the sea, and both near together. The Greek belongs to the sea as much as to the land; both his elements are here united to his advantage, the Persian himself not being a seaman (175-7). Delphi (178).

The movement of this Greek portion will therefore start with difference, with separation among the Greeks in its various shapes, and show the process of eliminating the unworthy who stood aloof through fear or enmity, or indifference.

1. The first ground of separation, then, is the giving of earth and water to the Persian messengers who were sent by Xerxes from Sardes to all the Greek cities. Those who complied are here mentioned, while Athens and Sparta on a former occasion had destroyed mercilessly the envoys sent to them on the same errand.

Of these two the Athenians were altogether the most active, and, though Sparta was the leader they (the Athenians) had made themselves the bearers of the great cause. The historian declares emphatically that if they had abandoned their country, or, remaining in it, had surrendered themselves to the Persian, the Greeks would have lost. They controlled the sea, and roused the other Greeks; they were, next to the Gods, the saviors of Greece. So speaks Herodotus, though he knows that he will excite great envy by the statement from the many enemies of the Athenians and their supremacy. N.B.

He goes on to tell how even the Delphic Oracle, when consulted by them, could not discourage them with an unfavorable response bidding them "leave their city and flee to the ends of the earth." Such was the first response, which the Athenian deputies would not accept as final; so they sought and obtained a second response, which said that "Zeus gives to Athena a wooden wall, impregnable, which will save thee and thy children." But what does this wooden wall mean? Still further: "O, divine Salamis, thou shalt cause the children of women to perish, whether the harvest be scattered or gathered." Here the Oracle is at least ambiguous, previously it was unambiguous in its dire announcement. This ambiguity then is a clear gain, the response is carried to Athens where N.B.

the man is on hand who can interpret it, for the interpretation is at present the main thing. This man we now hear of for the first time: Themistocles, son of Neocles, "lately risen to eminence;" he says that the wooden wall means the ships, to which the Athenians must betake themselves in case of invasion. Already the same man had persuaded the Athenians to build two hundred triremes, and master the sea in the war with Egina; so they have the wooden wall ready.

Such is the new man appearing above the turmoil, interpreter of ambiguous oracles, and thereby clearly placing himself above the Delphic Oracle. It is the dawn of the era of intelligence, which is henceforth to rule, though not in formal authority. Athens is the great positive upholder of the Greek idea against the Persian, and Themistocles is the incarnation of Athenian spirit at present.

Such is the first grand distinction among the Greeks, showing those who submit by sending earth and water and those who will not submit, even though discouraged by their own Oracle. Have they not become their own Oracle?

2. We are now to have a list of a somewhat different class of Greeks, who did not send earth and water to the Persians, but who stood aloof in the great crisis, from one pretext or other. They are the neutrals in the grand conflict which

determined the destiny not only of Greece but of the whole Occident. Four important States are mentioned, each one of which could have rendered assistance.

The case of Argos evidently caused much discussion in aftertimes; the historian gives three accounts. But one thing is certain: the Argives took no hand in the repulse of the Persian, and the suspicion hangs over them that they secretly favored the invaders of Hellas.

The case of Gelon, tyrant of Syracuse, was also variously reported. His power was greater than that of any other Greek State, and to him ambassadors were sent asking for assistance. Gelon did not appear, and it is manifest that he had a good reason. The same day on which the battle of Salamis (480 B. C.) was fought, there was a great battle with the Carthaginians who had invaded Sicily with a vast army, and Gelon had his hands full at home. Probably there was some kind of co-operation between Carthage and Persia; but from Greek Sicily the Oriental wave was rolled back, as in Greece proper. So we may excuse Gelon, at least he has the best excuse of all these States.

The Corcyraeans were also solicited to help the cause, and they said they would, but they did not fulfill and did not intend to fulfill their promise. They manned sixty ships and put to sea, but were careful not to reach Salamis. Their case is rather the worst of the four cited.

The Cretans were likewise invited to send assistance to their Greek brothers, and they consulted the God at Delphi as to what they should do. The answer of the Oracle was not very distinct, but the Cretans were evidently ready to interpret it as dissuasive, wherein they doubtless showed their inclination. Very different was the interpretation of an ambiguous response by the Athenians. So we shall have to place the Cretans in the list of the shirkers — where the historian places them evidently.

The Delphic Oracle in this Book has been playing a curious part. It dismayed the Athenians, giving the great upholders of the Greek cause little comfort; it dissuaded the Argives, who, however, were ready to set it aside; it gave a pretext to the Cretans for holding off. The Pythia is evidently somewhat demoralized, reflecting the prevalent terror and uncertainty of the Hellenic world. It is true that the Oracle told the Delphians to pray to the Winds (178), and the Winds did descend with vengeance upon the Persian fleet — which the Delphians seemed to have claimed as their special contribution to the cause.

To the above list of shirkers and refusers the Thessalians but partially belong, inasmuch as they yielded under necessity. Herewith we come to the Greek battle-line.

3. This was first in Thessaly, the Greeks

having resolved to defend the pass of Olympus, to which Athenian and Lacedemonian soldiers were sent. Then it was abandoned, as soon as it became known to them that there was another pass by which their position was rendered untenable. Themistocles was in command of the Athenians and we may suppose that he saw no hope in the situation.

Next the Greeks settle upon a new line of defense; they were to hold the pass at Thermopylae by land, and to occupy the strait at Artemisium by sea. These two places were not far from each other, and both were narrow and defensible by a small number of men. Such was the battle-line settled upon by the Greeks, where "they resolved to await the barbarian."

N.B. The fiery ordeal applied to the Greek world in this account of its mustering brings out strongly who are the true bearers of the Greek idea. The sifting is relentless, being the work of the spirit itself; some unite with the Persian through sympathy and some through fear; others refuse to co-operate with their countrymen through selfishness, through indifference, through too great an opinion of their importance. All such are remorselessly stricken from the roll of honor, and the historian is seen fulfilling his great task as a kind of world-judge, who calmly and impartially sets down the names of the guilty and transmits them to all time. For in this record

there is most emphatically a judgment, a sort of Last Judgment which separates the noble from the ignoble, and puts the one set into its historic Paradise, and the other into its historic Inferno.

Weltgeschichte is Weltgericht, says a famous German philosopher; World-History is World-Judgment. So Herodotus in his way metes out reward and punishment for eternity.

We observe that the great conquest of the Athenians in this Book is the conquest of the Delphic Oracle, which they compel (the word is not too strong) to take back the unfavorable response. This fact hints that Athens is really greater than the Oracle and truer to Greek spirit, and prophesies that the Oracle of new Greece will be at Athens, yet in the form of something higher than the Oracle (say art; poetry, philosophy). The Athenian will no longer accept the Delphic utterance as final for them; and if it be accepted (as in case of the "wooden wall") it must be interpreted into their spirit. Clearly Athens has transcended Delphi, and will soon manifest its rise out of the oracular into the artistic and philosophic expression of the Hellenic soul.

III.

Very distinctly does this Seventh Book show the two Musterings, Persian and Greek, with the advance of each toward the actual battle-line in

N. 13. its twofold character, on land and sea. The Greeks have already taken position on this line and the Persians advance to the conflict. The Greeks will be compelled to abandon both their stations, on land and on sea; the enemy cannot be barred out of Greece at the border. Spartan bravery alone cannot save the Hellenic world. The grand event now to be narrated is the battle of Thermopylae; but before it takes place, the historian describes a number of preliminary occurrences. This third portion embraces the rest of the Book (179-238).

1. These preliminary movements and events may be thrown into four groups in successive order; they being concluded, the two armies will stand face to face, and the battle will begin (179-200).

(1) The first blood of the war is spilled on the sea. The Persian fleet sets out from Therma, ten of the fastest vessels overtake three Greek ships, which are acting as sentinels at the island Sciathus; all three Greek ships are captured by the barbarians though the crew of the Athenian vessel escape by running their craft ashore. Rather an ominous encounter for a beginning; the Greeks are alarmed and retire from their station at Artemisium into the straits called the Euripus, which they prepare to defend (179-83).

(2) We now pass to the Persian land force (184), of which the historian here gives the

numbers. Likewise he enumerates the naval force. The sum total of fighting men he places at the enormous figure 2,641,610; he reckons the non-combatants to have been as many more. Very naturally these numbers are distrusted by modern historians, who have conjectured various devices for lessening them. This enumeration (184-7) has been preceded by the one at Doriscus (60). Since then, however, there have been many additions from the countries lying along the line of march. Just at present the Persian host has reached its highest figure; storms will soon lessen it, and combats by land and sea, and doubtless desertions, especially from the European contingents. So the enumeration is given at the flood-tide of the invasion, when it first strikes the Greek battle-line, at Thermopylae and Sepias (the latter being the Persian naval station).

It is, of course, a very difficult matter to ascertain whence Herodotus derived these numbers. Did he have access to any Persian documents on the subject? Or were they gathered by him from hearsay? He must have conversed with many people, both Persian and Greek, who took part in the expedition. The method of that enumeration at Doriscus remains very suspicious; it seems to imply that there were no muster-rolls, and no daily reports of numbers present.

(3) We next turn to the movement of the fleet (188-195), which has a double experience. Along the coast of Sepias the Persian fleet was overtaken by a terrific storm which did great injury, "destroying not less than four hundred ships, innumerable lives, and an untold amount of treasure." To the Greeks this was clearly a divine intervention in their favor; but who was the God? The Athenians claimed it as the work of their "son-in-law Boreas;" Poseidon the Deliverer had a share in the honor; the Persian Magi, by the instruction of the Ionians, sacrificed to Thetis and the Nereids, to whom all the coast of Sepias belonged; the Delphians also had a claim, having prayed to the winds. No outsider can settle the controversy; but one may well note that the Greek Gods are going to take a hand in the conflict, as they did of old (in the Iliad, for instance); the providential side has strongly asserted itself without any question, neither the ancient historian nor the modern reader can neglect it.

A second experience of that ill-fated Persian fleet: fifteen of its ships sail by mistake into the midst of the Greek squadron which had hastily returned to Artemisium (their naval station on the northern coast of Euboea), and are easily captured. Another providential gift, thinks the Greek; very encouraging it must be to see the Gods entering the struggle against the Orient

once more (for that is what they did in the ancient Trojan War).

(4) The movement by land is next taken up (196-201); Xerxes marches forward through Thessaly till he comes to Malis opposite the pass of Thermopylae, where he pitches camp. The two sides now stand in each other's presence, the battle is about to take place.

In the background the historian has not failed to set forth the mythical element of which this Thessalian region is the scene, both by land and sea. The coast of Sepias is the home of the sea-goddess Thetis, whom Peleus carried off from these parts, and Thetis was the mother of Achilles, the hero of the Iliad. Not far away is the spot where Jason is said to have abandoned Hercules, in the famous Argonautic expedition, which was also directed against a part of Asia. Xerxes himself listens to Greek legends told him at Alos in Achaea (197); near by his camp, in the Trachinian territory, is the place where Hercules died (on Mount Oeta); the legend declares that the stream Dyrras just here rose up from the earth in order "to assist him when burning" (198). Thus the locality of Thermopylae is full of Greek heroic legend; the two great mythical expeditions against Asia, the Argonautic and the Trojan, are suggested, and every Greek soul has this legendary stream pouring through it and mingling with the present. Now the Asiatic has invaded the

very territory of the heroes; surely the latter will assist their people in the present emergency. In such fashion does the mythical background fuse with the historical reality.

2. The battle of Thermopylae is recorded (201-233) with its immediate antecedents and results.

(1) The historian first calls the muster-roll of the Greeks who are present; all are commanded by Leonidas, the Spartan king, who has with him three hundred Spartans. At first he thinks of retreating to the Isthmus (of Corinth), but gives up the idea when he sees that the Phocians and Locrians, whose countries would thus be left to the Persian (207), were deeply indignant at the proposition.

In contrast with this historical statement, Xerxes is here introduced having a conversation with Demaratus, who assures him that these men are going to fight. An epical touch again, preparatory to the conflict at hand; it corresponds in style to the first portion of the Book.

Thus the two different ways of literary handling (Persian and Greek) as already exemplified in the two previous portions of the Book, are here put together (202-9).

(2) The special account of the battle and of its various stages is given with distinctness. (a) The assault of the Medes and Cisseans; first day, Persian defeat (210). The assault by the Per-

sian "Immortals;" again a Persian defeat. In this account the strong difference between the Persian mass and the Greek order is brought out (211-2); the king "leaps twice from his throne" as he witnesses the fight. (b) The road over the mountains flanking the Greek position is discovered to the Persian by a Greek named Ephialtes, accursed to all time for his traitorous act (213-8). The Phocians guarding this road retreat and let the Persians pass. (c) The fact is made known to the Greeks that they are flanked. The Spartans stay, the rest of the Greeks depart; whether they left of their accord or were sent away by Leonidas, remained an unsettled question in the historian's time. But the seven hundred Thespians refused to leave, they stayed and perished with the three hundred Spartans (219-222). Also Megistias, the augur, stayed, though dismissed by Leonidas. (d) The final struggle takes place (223-5). The Greeks with reckless bravery leave the wall at the narrow part of the pass between the mountains and the sea, and advance into the wide part of the defile. Here the battle continues till the Persians with Ephialtes approach in the rear. Then the Greeks except the Thebans, retreat to a hillock, "on which the stone lion now stands to the memory of Leonidas," where they perish to the last man. (e) Special mention (226-33). Herodotus is fond of giving the name of the doer of the deed,

be it good or bad; he individualizes. The Greeks are not an indiscriminate mass like the Persian army, where "no regard was paid to the individual perishing." One Spartan survived, his name and fate are given. "I have ascertained the names of the whole three hundred," which were engraved on a monument at Sparta erected about the year 440 B. C. (still seen by the traveler Pausanias). Herodotus probably saw this monument not long after its erection, indeed he may have been present at the ceremonies over the remains of Leonidas, when they were brought back to Sparta in the mentioned year. That would have furnished a good opportunity for collecting historic facts and anecdotes about the battle, and the historian probably seized it. Certainly he has a much clearer conception of the battle of Thermopylae, than he has of Marathon. It is likely, too, that he visited the battle-ground and studied its topography.

3. The historian passes to the Persian side and shows the inner workings there in a dialogue (234-8). That is, the epical manner is again introduced; Xerxes sends for Demaratus, the Spartan, and asks concerning these Spartan warriors, whose numbers are placed by the latter at eight thousand (not including the Lacedemonians and the Helots). "In what way shall we conquer them, with the least trouble?" asks the king.

Such a question does indeed imply a change in his temper. Demaratus gives the best advice possible: Take the island Cythera off the Laconic coast, and harass them from that point. But Achaemenes, brother of Xerxes, thwarts this project and tries to undermine the influence of Demaratus, charging all the Greeks with being envious, which is just the trait which he shows himself.

In this dialogue (237), Xerxes states his view of citizenship and friendship: "The citizen envies his fellow-citizen who is prosperous, but a friend (or guest) is delighted at the prosperity of his fellow-friend." An Oriental view surely; the Persian had no use for Greek citizenship with its equality, begetter of envy; but friendship could exist between master and slave.

Thus the Book ends with the attempt to set forth in fictitious form the movement in the mind of the Persian monarch, after the struggle at Thermopylae. Xerxes overrules Spartan advice in reference to Sparta, and takes the resolution not to separate the naval force, but to let it advance in the same way as before. The absolute sovereign directs all, as will be seen, to his own fatality. So the Seventh Book opens and concludes in epic fashion, yet with an introduction and an appendix.

This appendix (239) simply brings up a part of the account which was previously left out in

its proper place. It tells how the Spartans, first of all the Greeks, came to know of the intended expedition through Demaratus. But it must have been generally felt throughout the Greek world that a Persian invasion was likely to take place at any time. The conflict was at hand and had been intensifying for generations. The story of the waxen tablet of Demaratus, whose purport was divined by a woman, Gorgo, wife of Leonidas, is one of those entertaining personal anecdotes, which the historian has the habit of taking up into his narrative, and which seems to be derived from his visit to Sparta.

As regards the battle of Thermopylae, the reader is moved most powerfully to both feeling and reflection. Leonidas and his Three Hundred, who fought here, have produced a profound impression through all the ages since; we are not to forget, however, that seven hundred Thespians stayed and perished with them. Why not a greater force present? The Spartans were celebrating one of their festivals (the Carnean), and the Olympic games were also being held at the time. Very curious is the fact: the religious functions must be performed though the enemy be at the gates of Greece. Consequently an advance guard is sent, the rest are to follow.

It is not necessary to tell this story after Herodotus whose account has taken a lasting place in Universal History. What is the reason of its

power? Here is the idea of sacrifice for the great cause; not one man merely, but a band of men. It was their sacrifice to their conception of duty; the law was their master, the monarch was within, hence the strong contrast with the Persian mass.

Still, Thermopylae did not save anything; it was a sacrifice indeed, but an unnecessary sacrifice. Greece is tragic if its destiny be read by the light of Thermopylae; it will die bravely fighting, and that will be the end of it. The Orient will take possession of the Greek heritage as far as the Spartan deed is concerned.

Leonidas follows the Oracle literally, which says that one of the kings must perish. There is no interpretation of the Oracle, such as Themistocles gave; the letter is adhered to, though it killeth. So the Carnean festival and the Olympic games cannot be omitted or deferred; law has become a despot in the Spartan soul.

To be sure, there was a tendency in the Greek to play everything ideally in order to prepare himself for the reality. War was a kind of festival, with its contest, its victors, its crown, its personal skill and bravery. At Thermopylae the bravest man is designated by name, though he be merely a private man in the ranks; the palm of excellence is bestowed for all time. This history of Herodotus as already remarked, is a kind of judgment on the participants of the great

Olympic game called the Persian war; in many ways it adjusts itself to such a conception present to every Greek.

We may well call this Seventh Book ending in Thermopylae the Spartan Book of the present History. It shows Spartan character at its best, yet with all its limits. These limits the rigid hide-bound Spartan cannot of himself transcend, yet they must be transcended, if Greece is not to be tragic. The Athenian will reach over the Spartan limit, and lead Greece out of its impending tragic destiny to victory.

What impression has all this produced upon the Persian monarch? There is a distinct letting down of pride; here are men who cannot be made slaves. Again he feels the limitation; all his power can merely inflict death upon the free-man. Demaratus is once more introduced giving advice, after it is asked for, since Xerxes is now ready to listen. But the advice is not followed by the king, cannot be; the seizing of Cythera and the threatening of the Spartan territory would make it a war of skill, and the king would give up his principle of conquering directly by mass. So the king follows the counsel of Achaemenes, his brother, who still clings to the Persian view of the invincibility of number, in spite of the strong object lesson just received.

The reader is recommended to pay special attention to the structure of the present Book in

order to catch its art as well as its meaning. For a further help, we shall set down in the form of a brief tabular outline the three divisions just given and their leading subdivisions.

I. The Mustering of the Orient (1-131).

1. Xerxes in Asia (1-45).

(1) Internal Thread. The mind
of the king (1-18).
Speeches for and against
the invasion.

(2) External Thread. From Susa
to Abydus (19-45).

2. The crossing of Xerxes from Asia
into Europe (46-100).

(1) Internal Thread. The mind
of the king (46-53). Talk
with Artabanus.

(2) External Thread. Across the
Hellespont (54-100).

3. Xerxes in Europe (101-131).

(1) Internal Thread. The mind
of the king (101-104).
Talk with Demaratus.

(2) External Thread. From
Doriscus toward Greece
(105-131).

II. The Mustering of the Greeks (132-178).

1. Those who give and those who re-
fuse earth and water to the Persian
(132-147).

2. The Neutrals who neither submit nor refuse to submit (148-171).
3. The true defenders of Hellas being sifted out, rally on their two battle lines (172-8).

III. The battle of Thermopylae, with attendant circumstances before and after (179-238).

1. Various preliminary movements on sea and land (179-200).
2. Thermopylae — the locality, the contestants, and the contest (201-233).
3. Epical conclusion of the Book. The mind of Xerxes. Dialogue with Demaratus and Achaemenes (234-8). Anecdote of Demaratus (239).

Thus, in its conclusion, the Book seems to come back to the epical manner of its beginning, the object of which is to set forth the mind of Xerxes in its special workings, as well as to hint in a general way the total Persian consciousness. It is manifest that the pride of the Oriental monarch has received something of a shock by the contest at Thermopylae; a very rational question he asks Demaratus about the way to conquer the Spartans, but he relapses soon into his Persian fatuity through the words of his brother Achaemenes.

The reader will note with what care and repetition, and sometimes repeated repetition, we have sought to impress upon his mind the structural movement of the present Book. Let not his patience fail at the anxiety of the author to help him grasp what is fundamental in this very important stage of the History. We hold that the architectonic power of the historian reaches its highest point in the Seventh Book, though other Books and indeed the whole work are grand manifestations of that same power. But now the mighty event, for which the whole previous History is only a vast preparation, is about to transpire, and it must be recorded worthily; the historian must show himself the true successor of the poet of Iliad, whose theme is also at bottom just this same conflict between Orient and Occident. Most marvelously interwrought are the epical and the historical elements, though, of course, the whole is History, not Poetry. A true child of Homer is this Herodotus; his constructive ability is poetic, while his material is the historic fact.

BOOK EIGHTH.

In a number of respects this Book shows a contrast with the preceding one, which ended, as already stated, in a tragic manner. Surely there is no salvation for Greece, if Thermopylae gives the keynote of the war. The Spartans had control, not one Athenian was present in the fight apparently. But now we come again to an Athenian Book, and the decision of the struggle passes from land to sea, from Sparta to Athens. Xerxes at present controls Greek territory to the Isthmus of Corinth, the Spartans have not kept him back though they have died. But the Persian king does not control the sea, and, as we shall soon discover, cannot control it; this is the fact that settles the success of the invasion.

The Athenians have become a marine people, their character has been trained by the sea, whose mastery requires skill, versatility, courage,

readiness to meet new dangers. The Persians are a land people, so are the Lacedemonians; the greater has at Thermopylae overwhelmed the lesser. The Athenians are, however, both a land people and a sea people, we may say; they show, in the present conflict, the solidity and persistence of the former, the adjustability and resourcefulness of the latter. Already at Marathon they manifested what they could do on land; now they are to reveal what they are able to do by sea.

The Athenian character concentrates and culminates in a most marvelous individual, which the time calls forth as the leader — Themistocles. Hardly has a greater man appeared in history. We have already seen him commanding the Athenian contingent in Thessaly and retiring before the Persian advance. He must have felt then that the land was no place to make headway against Persia. He was the father of the Athenian navy, and now he takes his own offspring in hand. Of all men the most resourceful he appears, yet he has the moral drawbacks which seem to come with such a character; he will take and give bribes, he looks out for himself in his bravest moments; while destroying the Persian army, he makes friends with the Persians. Herodotus has remorselessly set down all his moral offenses, and seems to take special care to put behind every great deed of his

some selfish motive. For this reason it has been questioned whether our historian has given a wholly fair picture of Themistocles. Still the place of the latter in the struggle is shown to be supreme, altogether overtopping any Greek or any Persian, for he is first victorious over his own side, and then over the enemy.

This Book is, accordingly, the Book of Salamis, of the sea-fight, which really put a stop to the movement of the Persian nation westward. Moreover it heralds a new kind of warfare, which belongs peculiarly to the Occident. Sea-fights had occurred long before Salamis, but here it is naval skill which rises into prominence, and decides the contest. The Book falls into the following order:—

I. The movements on sea and land from the battle of Artemisium till after the battle of Salamis (1-96).

1. The first stage of affairs after Thermopylae (1-39).

(1) On the sea; battle of Artemisium (1-23).

(2) On land; Persian army divides: one part reaches Delphi (24-39).

2. The second stage; movement on both sides to Attica (40-55).

(1) On the sea; Greeks retire to Salamis (40-9).

- (2) On land; Xerxes marches to Athens (50-55).
3. Third stage; the battle of Salamis with the doings of Themistocles (56-96).
 1. Greek commanders first resolve to fight at Salamis, and then change their mind. Persian fleet comes up (56-74).
 2. Themistocles compels the fight on both sides (75-96), choosing time and place.
- II. After the battle is an intermediate period of relaxation and of readjusting movements on both sides (97-132).
 1. First stage; a mutual relaxation of the grip on both sides (97-112).
 - (1) Persian; the flight of Xerxes resolved on (97-107).
 - (2) Greek; the victors withdraw from pursuit (108-112).
 2. Second stage; both sides at rest (113-125).
 - (1) Persian; the army retires from Athens to Thessaly. Mardonius with select troops remains. Xerxes flees for Asia (113-120).
 - (2) Greek; fleet returns to Salamis; rewards distributed (121-5).

3. Third stage; some distant echoes of the struggle; complete final separation of the contestants (126-132).

(1) Persian; some fighting along the line in the north; the crossing into Asia (126-30).

(2) Greek; fleet refuses to go further than Delos (131-2).

III. Beginnings of the new conflict under Mardonius (133-144).

1. The Persian consults Greek Oracles (133-5).

2. The Persian attempts to detach the Athenians from the rest of the Greeks (136-144).

Thus we catch the bearing of the present Book, the great positive fact of which is the battle of Salamis, with movements before and after. Indeed this battle is the culmination of the whole war, which has swept steadily forward from Asia through Europe up to Salamis, where the blow is delivered which causes the mighty armament both naval and military, to reel back into Asia, whence it came. Even further we may extend our thought of this event, and regard it as the decisive action which proclaims that the Orient is not to rule the Occident. To be sure, the war is not yet over, though it is decided; the Greeks

possess the sea, and therewith are saved. The islands of the Aegæan can be held only by naval supremacy, which is now lost to the Persian.

The above divisions of the Book, we shall develop into fuller detail, following the text of the historian.

I.

As already indicated, the first portion gives the movement by sea and by land from Artemisium and Thermopylae to Athens and Salamis. The first battle-line is broken through by the Persians and abandoned by the Greeks; both sides come together in and around Salamis where the naval struggle takes place.

The structure of this portion of the Eighth Book is somewhat intricate and resembles the structure of the first portion of the Seventh Book. There are two threads, the sea and the land, each with its own movement, which has three distinct stages, in the sweep from the northern battle-line to Salamis.

1. The first stage shows the situation by sea and land after Thermopylae together with the naval conflict. The latter is narrated first, and is called the battle of Artemisium, being the prelude to Salamis.

(1) The muster-roll of the Greek ships is given in which Athens is seen to have the

greater number (counting the twenty furnished by them to the Chalcidians) at the start, and a still larger preponderance at the end. In addition she furnishes the spirit and the brain, still she has not the chief command, which she resigns for the sake of unity. This mighty act of renunciation is her chief glory, and really gives her the secret, compelling power of the time. She possesses also the intellect of Greece in the person of her commander Themistocles, who sees that the right place to fight the battle is the narrow strait in which the number of the enemy's ships is the enemy's disadvantage. Still he has to conquer his own side first; his allies must be deceived into doing the right thing, or be bribed into doing it. The trouble is, authority and capacity are divorced, the commander and the wise man are two different persons. Athens is the soul of the fleet, and Themistocles is its mind. He takes his means to accomplish his end, the question being, shall I be a moralist or a patriot?

So the fight by sea starts. First a little rush in the late of afternoon for a test; the Greeks take thirty ships, surely a good omen. Then comes a terrific storm whose violence chiefly falls upon the unprotected vessels of the barbarians; the Gods are undoubtedly taking a hand in the contest. Finally on the third day, a severe battle is fought, apparently with the balance in favor

of the Greeks. But Thermopylae being lost, they have to withdraw southward to Greece.

Such is the preliminary naval conflict, in which several things come out clear. The Athenians are essentially the masters of the situation, the sea is to them no Thermopylae, and Themistocles is no Leonidas. The manner of overcoming the Persian fleet is taught by experience; it must be attacked in a strait where its numbers will simply be an impediment. Where is such a place? Salamis, whose battle will be a repetition of Artemisium. Such is the experience here gained, very useful; one can well imagine that the Athenians sailed homeward with forebodings dark enough for their city, yet seeing rifts in the clouds, which let some rays of golden hope drop down over the sea.

(2) The narrative next passes to the land (24), and recounts the doings of Xerxes and his host after the battle of Thermopylae. He permits whoever wishes, to pass from the fleet to the land and take a view of the dead Spartans, "the senseless men who hoped to overthrow the king's power." Still he employs a trick to conceal his own loss.

The land march for Greece then begins, and the army reaches Panopeae in Phocis, where it divides, part going to Delphi and the rest moving towards Athens. These two places may indeed be called the two centers of Greek civili-

zation — the one is the instinctive Oracle, passing out, the other is self-conscious Intelligence, coming in. The Persian struck at both, and failed in both blows. N.B.

Yet very different is the character of the two repulses. At Delphi the God himself enters the conflict, the sacred arms "which it was not lawful for any mortal to touch," were miraculously taken down and lay before the temple; crags fell from the mountains above, a war-shout came from Minerva's fane, and the enemy fled in a great panic. The repulse from Delphi was supernatural, the work of the God without human aid, for he declared that he would "look after his own," and nearly all the Delphians ran away. Very different is the repulse of the Persian at Athenian Salamis, as we shall see; that is supremely the work of man's intelligence; nay, the Oracle first with its discouraging and then with its ambiguous responses had to be interpreted and transcended by those epoch-making Athenians. The transition from the old to the new Hellas we may read in the battles at Delphi and at Salamis.

2. The historian brings before us the sea forces of the Greeks and the land forces of the Persians at a common point in Attica (40-55). The king takes the external Athens, its houses and locality, but the Athenians are in their ships, out of his reach, yet in sight. In the strongest

v. 8. way the situation shows the triumph of mind; let the king burn their city, they can and will build another and a better. Such is the protection now given by those wooden walls which Themistocles has caused them to construct.

(1) The Grecian fleet moves from Artemisium to Salamis "at the request of the Athenians," who find the selfish Peloponnesians fortifying the Isthmus and leaving Athens to her fate. But a number of new ships appear, and again the muster-roll is given. The Peloponnesians of the fleet propose to desert Salamis, as they deserted Athens on land. Here is the problem which Themistocles has to meet; he must conquer his own people and compel them to give battle in the right place (40-49).

(2) The army of Xerxes reaches Athens (50) where a few citizens have chosen to remain and defend themselves in the Acropolis behind some planks and stakes, deeming such to be the wooden wall intended by the Oracle. But they are captured and destroyed, after a valiant defense; they did not interpret the Oracle aright, taking it altogether too literally. So they died the death of heroes, like the Spartans at Thermopylae. Here too miracles transpire: the sacred serpent leaves the Acropolis, and the sacred olive, burnt in the conflagration of the temple, sends up a new shoot a cubit long in a day.

3. In the two previous stages of the move-

ment to Salamis we have followed the sea and the land in regular order; but in the third stage at which we have now arrived, the structure changes somewhat, the same elements are present, but are brought before us in a different order. Xerxes is here, active, yet rather helpless, with his enemies in their ships, out of his way; the Persian fleet comes up, and takes position; the Peloponnesians complete their wall at the Isthmus. It is a very lively picture, with strong dramatic coloring; narrative repeatedly goes over into dialogue.

There is one person around whom the movement gathers irresistibly. Not the Greek king, not the Spartan commander, it is Themistocles, who becomes the hero more than ever. He, though not the official admiral, compels the unwilling Peloponnesian to fight where and when he wishes; for the Persian enemy likewise he selects the time and place for the battle.

This part of the Book will naturally organize itself along the line of Themistocles' doings, since he is really the moving power. A great variety of matters go to make up the picture, but he is the central figure, the one greatest man, bearer of the World-Spirit, and not alone of nationality.

(1) The Greeks at Salamis have had a council, and have resolved to go to the Isthmus and fight there. The spirit is that each contingent wishes

to fight for its own separate city, and not for all Greece. The spirit of individualism is tearing them to pieces; one people alone, the Athenians, seem animated with a Pan-Hellenic feeling, and Themistocles just now is its representative. At once he starts to work to annul the decree, "for if the Peloponnesians remove the fleet from Salamis, they will, each, betake themselves to their own cities." Such is the true view of Athenian Mnesiphilus, here recorded. In the second council Themistocles makes a great speech, stating the innermost fact of the situation that "the whole success of the war depends on our fleet," and threatening that the Athenians will quit Greece altogether and go to Siris in Italy, "which, the oracles say, is to be inhabited by us" — which oracles, however, were never verified. But Themistocles gains his point; Eurybiades, the Spartan admiral, resolves to stay. Nor must we forget that characteristic sentence of his. "To those deliberating reasonably, success usually comes; but if men deliberate unreasonably, not even the God will come to the aid of human caprices."

As the counterpart to this speech, follow divine signs, miracles, prayers, holy ceremonies. There was an earthquake, all the Gods were invoked and specially the local heroes of Salamis; the local heroes of Egina the Aeacidæ, were sent for and brought in a ship; above all the mystic

procession was heard, and a great cloud of dust rose along the sacred way of Eleusis, "as if of thirty thousand men." So the supernatural element is not wanting in this mighty conflict; nor is the rational principle lacking; indeed both are co-operating for the one great end.

The Persian fleet passes from Artemisium to Athens, where the army had already arrived. Here we have a consultation on the Persian side, the question being, Shall we fight the Greek fleet in this place? One person only, Artemisia the queen of Halicarnassus, gave a dissuasive answer, stating the difficulties with great frankness, which pleased the king. Still the latter issued orders for the battle to take place.

(2) In the Greek fleet the discontent of the Peloponnesians breaks out into open reproaches, and a new council is called in which the former resolution to stay at Salamis is overruled. Now comes the master stroke of Themistocles to make them stay and fight there. He sent a trusted servant, Sicinnus by name, to the Persians with a message. The result was threefold: first, the Persian fleet at once prepared for a battle on the morrow; second, the Greek fleet was surrounded in the night by the enemy's ships and could not escape; third, Themistocles pretended to the Persians to send the message in the interest of the king, from whom, in case of necessity, he might claim hereafter the reward

of a benefactor. Thus he was already preparing a place to leap upon, should matters turn out amiss.

The council was still sitting when word came that the passage outward was no longer open. Aristides first brings the news, then a Tenian ship deserting from the Persian, confirms it. Three different councils have been held, but all have at last to do what Themistocles says. His stratagem forces the Greeks into union and into a battle for the whole country; he must save them against their own folly. The Spartan has a single means, the Athenian has many means; the one perishes, the other triumphs. Themistocles has no moral sense, yet he has patriotism in the highest degree, when the crisis is on; but when the conflict is over, he must look out for a day of reckoning for his moral delinquencies. So while hitting the Persian on the head a blow which sends him reeling out of Europe, Themistocles prepares for a future emergency, a possible flight to Persia, which will indeed become actual. Such is the duplicity of intellect in this man, he sees the two sides in everything; his advice to fight is made good for both sides, and his later advice to Xerxes to flee is good for Greek and Persian. Sophist that he is, he can give the best reason to each party, and make both believe him and follow him.

The conflict takes place (83-96), must take

Themisto
N.B.

place. Themistocles is the gigantic figure compelling and controlling the action; he holds the heads of both contestants in his hands and knocks them together. To be sure, he strikes the harder blow against the Persian, who now finds out that he cannot conquer Greece. The battle of Salamis is essentially the work of Themistocles, backed, of course, mightily by the Athenians. What constitutes a people was never more truly seen than when they, without city and country, stood on board their ships, their wooden walls, and conquered. The spirit was there, and had built those walls and would build new walls and a city anywhere. Already we have noted that they represented something far beyond themselves, something of which they were hardly conscious; they were the instruments of a new stage of the World's progress.

II.

The battle having been fought, the historian gives an account of what takes place on both sides, Persian and Greek, after the great victory. The fight was a terrible strain for both, and it is no wonder that a kind of relaxation and unwillingness to act set in afterwards; the result was indeed so stunning that both antagonists suffered for a time a sort of paralysis of will. Moreover winter was approaching and the season invited to rest. Our historian will trace this period in a

series of short sketches, passing rapidly from one side to the other three times, and thereby showing both the succession and the contemporaneousness of certain events (97-132).

1. Both sides, Persian and Greek, are seen slowly letting go their hold of each other, and drawing back after their great effort (97-112).

(1) On the Persian side, this fact comes out plainly in the present attitude of the king, who seems to have been thoroughly frightened and demoralized by the unexpected outcome of the battle. He is afraid "of being shut up in Europe;" no wonder that he feels uncomfortable; he now fully realizes that Europe does not belong to him, and he wishes to get out of it as soon as possible.

Again we have an epical treatment of the situation, which reveals the inner workings of the mind of the king. Mardonius addresses him, craftily advising flight, "with the greatest part of the army;" but the same general also declares, "I shall deliver to you Greece enslaved, having selected from the Persian host three hundred thousand men." Mardonius sees his opportunity, as his ambition is to make himself "satrap of Hellas." Queen Artemisia is also introduced with her advice at this juncture of events; she flatters her royal master with that delicate touch of "having burned Athens, for which you undertook the expedition," and advises him to return.

*Mardonius
ambition*

home. Xerxes was of course "pleased with her advice, for she happened to say the very things which he designed." Clearly Artemisia knows her man, that Halicarnassian queen is not devoid of a subtle insight into character. So the king honors her specially, for she has coated over the bitter pill of humiliation with the sweetest covering of adulation, woman that she is as well as Oriental warrior.

It is highly probable that Herodotus picked up this story of Artemisia and Xerxes in his native Halicarnassus. The exploits of the queen must have been the talk of the town, embellished doubtless with many fictitious turns. Also the story of the vengeance of Hermotimus, interwoven at this point (105), is in the nature of a current anecdote, showing the hostility of the popular mind to certain Persian customs. Pedasus, the native place of Hermotimus, was not far from Halicarnassus.

(2) The Greeks (108-112) expected to continue the fighting off Salamis, but the fleet of the enemy fled rapidly, by the king's order, to protect the bridges at the Hellespont. The Greeks pursued for a short distance and Themistocles favored going at once to the Hellespont and destroying the bridges; but the Peloponnesians thought of home, and preferred to let the Persians get out of Europe. Hereupon Themistocles changes his tactics, and helps on the

flight of the Persians by a secret message, seeking to secure their favor hereafter "if any thing should happen to him from the Athenians." Such is the motive here assigned to him by the historian; but a doubt will always arise in the mind of the reader about its correctness. From what sources did Herodotus get all these facts concerning Themistocles? Unquestionably from the society surrounding him during his stay in Athens.

It is quite clear, however, that Themistocles with his powerful fleet, besieged Andros and extorted large sums of money from the islanders. Again we behold the greatest Athenian general, after heroic devotion and self-denial, turning into a freebooter, though he has the pretext against these towns and islands that they had "medized." The same fatality lies in him which we saw in Miltiades after Marathon. Themistocles also will vanish out of sight after this one grand success, and at last he himself will "medize," will flee to Persia, seeking to undo his great deed. Tragic as Miltiades he is, though the manner of his ending be different. This part of his story, however, is not told by Herodotus, but by the latter's great successor, Thucydides. Something of the same character is in Athens herself, which character will develop more and more with time, and furnish the leading theme of a later portion of Greek history.

2. In this second stage (113-125) both sides are briefly brought before us withdrawing from conflict and passing into a state of rest.

(1) Mardonius with his chosen troops goes into winter quarters in Thessaly. Xerxes continues his flight, crosses the Hellespont in haste, and at last reaches Sardes, in Asia Minor, where for the first time apparently since the battle of Salamis he takes an easy breath. ~~The most humiliating spectacle known to history probably is this flight of Xerxes.~~ Considering the way he came into Europe and the way he went out, one thinks that the contrast could not be greater. The former flight of Darius from Scythia is small in comparison, and the Moscow retreat is a lesser parallel.

(2) The Greeks return to Salamis (121-5), and divide the booty between the Gods and themselves, for the Gods unquestionably lent a hand in the fight. Then the fleet sails to the Isthmus in order to award the prize of valor to the most deserving Greek. Each general voted the first prize to himself, for each "thought himself the most valiant;" but a majority voted the second prize to Themistocles. Too good a story to be exactly true, one thinks; but we may accept the statement that "the Greeks would not determine the matter out of envy," though public opinion throughout Greece gave emphatically the honor to the right man, Themistocles (124).

3. For the third time the historian introduces the two armaments in a short section (126-32), which shows some of the side issues of the great contest, while the main forces of the two antagonists are quiet and wholly separated from each other.

1. The Persian contingent under Artabazus (126), having escorted Xerxes to the Hellespont, was on its way back to Mardonius, when it sought to suppress revolts of Greek cities in the North, as Potidaea and Olynthus. The battle of Salamis had stirred evidently the Greek towns along the Persian line of march, indeed the whole Hellenic world saw a new destiny for themselves through that victory over the Orient; in their spirits the Occident had really dawned. Artabazus meets with a disaster, and is repelled from Potidaea with loss (129) by the allied Greeks of that region. Meanwhile the Persian fleet kept timidly at Samos, watching over Ionia, "lest it should revolt;" for all the Greek islands and the Greek settlements along the coast of Asia Minor had heard of the great victory and were fermenting. We read that "most of the marines were Medes and Persians," a land-people, without experience of the sea, and hence "they despaired of success" against the Athenians; nor could they trust to the Ionic sailors of the Aegæan.

(2) The Greeks began to assemble their fleet in the spring at Egina (131), with a new Lacede-

monian admiral, Leotychides; the Athenians also have a new commander, Xanthippus, the father of Pericles. Themistocles now disappears from this history; it is highly probable that his day of reckoning had come, which indeed he was always expecting, as we have seen by his dealings with the Persians. His successor, Xanthippus, is the same who prosecuted Miltiades on a capital charge (VI. 136). We have already noted that Herodotus had probably access to the Periclean circle during his visit to Athens: in that quarter he obtained, it may be supposed, his main facts about Themistocles.

The Greek fleet does not show its old nerve and aggressiveness; on the contrary it seems lethargic and even terrified. What is the reason? No Themistocles in it now, the one man who is all, and without whom all are none. Embassadors come from Chios and beseech the Greek commanders "to liberate Ionia;" in vain. The Greeks with difficulty are prevailed on "to advance as far as Delos;" they are afraid to go further (132); Samos seems to them "as far as the pillars of Hercules." What is the matter? Our answer is, they have no Themistocles, but a Xanthippus, who is a good accuser evidently, but a poor doer.

Herodotus, son of Basilides, was one of these embassadors from Chios, the only one of them mentioned by name here. It has been conject-

ured that he was in some way connected with our historian, bearing the same name, and being so specially designated by his kinsman in the present passage.

III.

We have in the concluding chapters of the present Book, the beginning of the rise out of this inactive condition, particularly on the part of the Persian, who are indeed a great will-people. Mardonius from his quarters in Thessaly seeks to do two things here recorded, by way of preparation for his future campaign against Greece (133-144).

1. He sends a man by the name of Mys to consult the Greek Oracles. Exactly what the motive of Mardonius was in this matter, our historian does not pretend to say; but there must have been naturally some feeling in the Persian mind that the Greek Gods had shown themselves the stronger in the present conflict. Could not the secret of the future be discovered? Could they not somehow be conciliated? We recollect how that Croesus (in the First Book) sought to harmonize himself with Greek religious conceptions, and to win the favor of the God by his rich offerings at the shrine of Apollo at Delphi. Not much is told, and the whole winds up in a miracle, "an answer given in the Carian tongue" by a Greek priestess apparently, whereat the

messenger returns to Thessaly with the response written down by himself. Very wonderful indeed; but what of it?

2. The other effort of Mardonius here recorded is far more noteworthy; it is his attempt to detach Athens from the Greek league by means of Alexander, a native of Macedon, who was a friend and benefactor of the Athenians. Herein the Persian commander undoubtedly shows his insight; he selects the very soul of opposition to his sway. The offer is certainly tempting; the Lacedemonian ambassadors are present and make counter promises. The answer of the Athenians to Alexander has in it an energy which thrills through all time: "Go tell Mardonius that the Athenians say that never, as long as the sun continues to shine in the same course as now, shall we come to terms with the Persians." Then to the Lacedemonian ambassadors they reiterate the same sentiment with almost equal emphasis. They only ask that the Greek army be sent to their support with all reasonable expedition, in order to attack the enemy in Boeotia, "before he has reached Attica," as they expected a new invasion of their territory. This moderate request, whose fulfillment would be as advantageous to the rest of the Greeks as to the Athenians, is not faithfully complied with by the Lacedemonians, who delay their armament, till Athens is captured a second time (see next Book).

BOOK NINTH.

The connection between this and the preceding Book is direct; the Persians are now to be swept out of Europe into Asia, and this process is to take place both by land and sea. It is the third act of the drama, beginning with Thermopylae. Salamis is really the central struggle; ~~if the Persians cannot control the Greek sea, they cannot control the Greek people, who are of the sea as much as of the land.~~ Especially is this the case with the Athenians, who pass from their city to their ships with facility. Salamis is the test fight, the mediating victory, which is now to bring about the final triumph, passing to the land with the Athenians, who are also in the fight on shore.

But there is one strange difference between the two Books. The hero of the Eighth Book — Themistocles — has somehow vanished com-

pletely, his name is not mentioned, nor has he any command. Aristides is just mentioned as the commander of the Athenians at Platea, but his personality is not prominent in the battle. Indeed, no strong individual now rises out prominently from the main body of Athenians. The Spartan Pausanias is the most conspicuous individual at Platea, and his greatest trait is that he is free of the ordinary hide-bound Spartan stubbornness and egoism, and calls for the Athenians in critical cases, whom he certainly appreciates. Such is his chief merit which makes a great improvement upon Leonidas; he supplements Spartan defects with Athenian excellences, and renders victory inevitable.

The Book has three portions: 1st. Platea; defeat by land of Persians and Asiatics, who are mostly destroyed, except a body which hurries out of Europe (1-89); 2d. Mycale; the Persian fleet is driven off the sea and burnt; end of the Persian navy and the sequel to Salamis (90-113); 3d. Sestos is taken in the North, the cables of the great bridge which connected Europe and Asia for the barbarian are captured and dedicated; the Homeric hero Protesilaus is avenged (114-123).

I.

The first portion deals with the land battle at Platea (1-89). A very full account on the

whole; our historian had made extensive inquiries among all parties engaged, specially at Platea, where he inspected the monuments of the conflict. The central thing for comprehending the battle is to grasp and follow the different positions of the Greeks.

1. *Preliminary* (1-18). Mardonius seeks again to detach Athens, which refuses with even greater emphasis than before. Yet the Greek allies delay, so that the Athenians have to desert a second time their city, which is again taken and laid waste. Athenian ambassadors at Sparta protest, but there is still delay; a festival, the Hyacinthia, is the pretext. The speech of the Athenian is very keen and even threatening, and at last the Lacedemonians start.

Unquestionably the charge of delay holds against the Lacedemonians, yet not to the extent here indicated. There is hardly a doubt but that they intended to help Athens at last. The ten days' delay and the silence of the Ephors can be accounted for by what we find in the text of Herodotus. It takes time to mobilize such a large force—the largest Sparta ever sent out. It was indeed for her a tremendous effort. It was hardly Chileus, the Tegean, who roused them by his warning words, for they could by no means have done all this work in a night. Reasons for such secrecy can be given: the Spartan character and policy, which sought to keep their army's

“numbers hid from strangers (Thuc. V. 68).” It was also an object to pass by Argos without trouble or delay (see later). It is plain, therefore, that while the Ephors were putting off the Athenian embassy, they were making all preparations. So far we may correct Herodotus by his own text.

Still the charge of undue delay holds. Every feeling of honor and the faith of promises ought to have bound the Lacedemonians not to permit Athens to be deserted a second time, but to fight the enemy in Boeotia where at last the battle did take place. In a sense, however, all these events showed the Athenians absolutely independent of the Peloponnesians, for Salamis could be held easily against the Persian. Just that island and its narrow strait rendered Greek history possible by saving Athens, which now really rules the sea, and with it holds in her hand Greek destiny.

On the Persian side Mardonius retires to Boeotia. Observe two typical events: the entertainment at Thebes and the presentiment of defeat among the Persians, there being good grounds for it; also the affair with the Phocians and the working of the PHEME (the premonitory voice).

2. *March of the Greeks to the first position (19-24).* The Peloponnesians gather at the Isthmus, but no Athenians; so the allies have to do as the Athenians said; the latter join the army at

Eleusis in Attica, crossing over from Salamis, where they were out of danger, while the Peloponnesians were certainly not. Those Athenians most nobly were again giving themselves to the cause, after bad treatment. Perhaps a little sulky at first, but they bring the spirit of victory with them. So they reach the first position at Erythrae in Boeotia while the enemy lies along the river Asopus.

The Greeks keep the high ground, shun the plain on account of Persian cavalry, which assails them notwithstanding; the Megarians call for help, none offer to go but Olympiodorus and a band of Athenians with the bowmen. Here occurs the death of Masistius, followed by the capture of his body. He was the Persian cavalry leader. First blow, and the Athenian in the front.

Great encouragement results; the Greeks find they can fight cavalry with success, something not yet done even by the Athenians at Marathon. Now the fact is proved by them; in exalted hope, the whole army makes a new move.

3. *The second position of the Greeks (25-50).* This lies further down the mountain, more in the plain, with a better supply of water from the fount Gargaphia. More audacious, perhaps a little too much so, the Greeks become. The dispute as to the place on the left wing between Tegeans and Athenians is significant. Mythical

claims both sides make, but Athens has the historical fact, Marathon. Still she will not quarrel at such a time, she is willing to fight anywhere, let the Lacedemonians decide. And they all shouted: the Athenians are the worthier. Such is the most heart-stirring incident in this whole history; such self-suppression in view of the cause is the Athenian glory. The Athenian spirit is again strongly applauded by the Lacedemonians, it will be a powerful influence in the future battle, and it now overwhelms the Tegeans, for the Lacedemonians would not decide till this manifestation. The Tegeans get a good place next to the Lacedemonians; they did not sulk, but won great honor in the fight.

The roll is now called by the historian on each side. Among the Greeks forget not the 40,000 Helots fighting for Greek liberty, four times more than all the Lacedemonians, and over one-third of the whole army.

The diviner has very important part in this battle; note Tisamenus and his story (33). Mardonius has likewise his Greek soothsayer at first, Hegesistratus, who also has a history. The sacrifices on both sides are not favorable for battle. The stopping of Greek supplies (38) is a serious but not a fatal mishap. Victims do not permit the fight; perchance neither side wishes to start the attack. Other incidents of note: the refusal of Mardonius to employ bribery; his respect

for the Delphic Oracle ; Alexander comes to the Greek camp with a secret message (45).

This message frightens Pausanias, who perhaps now overestimates the Athenians, offering to change wings with them. It is indeed a most surprising incident. Never could there have been so complete an acknowledgment of the Athenians' place in the conflict. But the wings change back again when the move does no good ; it encourages, however, the Persians, who make a fresh attack and choke up the fountain Gargaphia, which compels the Greeks to take a new position.

4. *Third position of the Greeks* (51-69). They now shift to the Island, ten stades distant, near Platea, where they have water and a higher ground, more out of the way of the cavalry. The center retreats in bad order, and does not take the position assigned ; the Lacedemonians are stopped by one of their captains refusing to stir — an unexpected obstacle. The Athenians stay and keep a sharp outlook over the Lacedemonians, evidently distrusting them somewhat, for the gap in the middle seems suspicious to the Athenians. So they send and get answer that they should adjust themselves to the Lacedemonians, and come to them (fill the gap for the present). Very significant again is the place of the Athenians in this affair. They are really the people relied on by Pausanias to help out, and

they do so always. Finally the Lacedemonians start and keep close to the hills, fearing the cavalry. The Athenians move down into the plain, to attract the cavalry probably from the dis-united Greeks. What a contrast in the inner discipline between Athenians and Spartans! Still the Spartans remained visible to the enemy, and were pursued by the Persians, while the Athenians were not seen, as they passed through the plain. Again an urgent request comes to the Athenians from Pausanias, when he is attacked by the cavalry; almost terror-stricken does he seem in this appeal.

The battle is brought on by the retrograde movement, the Persians advancing in a disorderly way. Victims are still not favorable, but the Tegeans start anyhow. Some time after them the Spartans follow. The Persians show themselves not trained, though brave; Artabazus, however, runs off with a large detachment of the Persian army.

So the battle is fought chiefly by the Lacedemonians and the Athenians — the former overthrowing the Persians, the latter the Thebans, who flee to this city; the Athenians then turn aside to the Persian camp or wall.

5. *Events at the Persian wall* (70-85). Again the Athenians have to do the new work; they surmount the wall, make the breach when the Tegeans and Lacedemonians pour in. This is

like the wall at Troy which no personal bravery can take, no Achilles, but Ulysses (intelligence). It is affecting to see how the historian rescues the bravest Spartan, Aristodemus, from the injustice of his countrymen, the one survivor of Thermopylae. Pausanias is heroized in several anecdotes: he protects a fleeing concubine; he spurns an inhuman proposal of an Eginetan; he refuses to slay the innocent sons of the Theban leader who has escaped.

6. *Siege of Thebes and the flight of the Persians* (86-89). As in legend, so now in history. There is something un-Greek in Thebes, something Asiatic, which Greece has to put down. Thebes falls, offering to surrender its medizing leaders. So we have the historical siege of Thebes, which has its mythical counterpart in the heroic age of Greece.

The Persians under Artabazus continue their flight and reach Byzantium, where they cross over by boats into Asia. Pausanias would allow no pursuit, but he let them flee, which was the best policy under the circumstances.

Note the place which the Athenians hold in this battle, being the very soul of the army and its intelligence; they, though without supreme authority, still control mainly, as Themistocles did at the battle of Salamis. They give the first encouragement by slaying Masistius, and they first meet the Persian cavalry so terrible to the

Lacedemonians. The latter could not keep them down in a subordinate rank.

Very interesting must have been the visit of Herodotus to Platea, which took place probably while he was staying at Athens, with possible letters of introduction from Pericles. These would give him many friends from the start; forth we see him going, from the Platean walls to view the monuments with distinguished Plateans as guides.

II.

We now pass to the fleet and to the battle of Mycale in Asia Minor (90-113), which occurred on the same day on which the battle of Platea took place. The Samians go to the Greek fleet for help against the Persian, and the Lacedemonian admiral starts from Delos, Deiphonus (God's voice) acting as diviner.

This Deiphonus receives special attention here in a story. It is noticeable that in these later Books the historian gives greater prominence to the diviners (or augurs) than in the other portions of his History. They are mentioned by name along with the generals, and the battle cannot proceed without them, though it would seem that the Tegeans "defied augury" and began the battle at Platea. Moreover these diviners are deemed worthy of a biographic account (see the narrative about Tisamenus, the diviner for

the Spartans IX. 33, and of Hegesistratus, the diviner for Mardonius, IX. 37; especially is Megistias honored with an epigram by Simonides, being the diviner at Thermopylae and perishing there with the Spartans, though he foreknew his fate, VII. 228).

The Persians send home the Phoenician ships, completely giving up the control of the sea, and they hasten with their other ships to the land at Mycale. They make a kind of wall and prepare to defend themselves. PHEME, Rumor, that divine voice, is also heard here, and passing through the camp of the Greeks, announces the victory at Platea (an anticipation of the modern telegraph).

The enemy were commanded by Tigranes, "who excelled the Persians in beauty and in stature." It is characteristic of Greek artistic spirit that the most beautiful men are specially designated in the text of the historian. Calliocrates, a Spartan, "came to the army the handsomest man of the Greeks of that time," hence he is to receive particular mention. In like manner the beauty of three Persian leaders is duly celebrated — Masistius, Mardonius, and Tigranes. Thus the beautiful, as manifesting itself in the human form, gets its due in this history of the great conflict, soon after which plastic Art is to reach its highest terrestrial bloom at Athens in the workshop of Phidias.

In the battle at Mycale the Athenians are easily the first; they outstrip the Lacedemonians and defeat the enemy in advance. What shall we say about Athens and her people throughout this war? The greatest marvel of all is just their spirit; they appear to have a demonic impulse to the great action; wherever they go, victory is in the air. They do not seem to have had a diviner, and it was probably they who did not like Deiphonus (the diviner who had been brought by the Corinthians), saying that he served for hire (95). The era of intelligence has clearly dawned at Athens, as has been already indicated more than once.

In the concluding part of this section (107-113), the historian gives us some peeps into the internal quarrels among the Persians. It is plain that the grand failure of the expedition has caused many reproaches and recriminations. The story of Xenagoras, a Halicarnassian (and hence the fellow-countryman of our historian), who saved the life of the brother of Xerxes, was probably heard by Herodotus in his native town.

A deeper cast has the love-affair of Xerxes with the wife of his brother Masistes (108). It shows the intrigues of the absolute monarch for the gratification of his passion; he does not spare his nearest kin; Persian degeneracy has evidently set in, the manly virtues of Cyrus and of Darius are overshadowed by luxury. The end is a

tragedy of the darkest hue; the honorable man and woman at the Persian court are first undone and then destroyed. This is our last glimpse of Xerxes, hinting the miserable outcome of his mighty expedition against Greece; the tale inserted just here has its strong suggestion, which the historian with his artistic instinct must have felt at the present conjuncture.

III.

The third portion of the present Book (114-122) is brief and is the conclusion of the whole History. The author has brought to an end the theme with which he began; beyond the Persian War of Xerxes he does not intend to carry us, though at the end he casts a significant glance into the epoch that is coming.

After the battle of Mycale, the combined fleet of the Greeks set out for the Hellespont to destroy the bridge between Asia and Europe, which they find broken asunder already. At this point occurs the grand separation between Athenians and Lacedemonians, never again to be entirely healed, and the starting-point of a new stage of Greek history. "Leotychides with the Peloponnesians concluded to sail home, while Xanthippus with the Athenians resolved to stay and to try to subdue the Chersonesus." Such is the difference which will continue to widen till it becomes the Peloponnesian War between Athens

and Sparta. The Athenians besiege and take Sestos which may be deemed the beginning of the Athenian Empire; they now act for themselves, and the leaders seem to have a presentiment of the new order (117).


Here we have the mythical element of the past connected with the historical element of the present in a story which tells of the Persian wrong done to the hero Protesilaus, who was the first Greek to land and to fall at Troy, and of the ample revenge of his wrong by the Greeks. The Persian commander of the district had robbed and desecrated the sanctuary of the Greek hero, alleging to Xerxes that this Greek "had carried arms into your territories." By this allusion we see that both Persian and Greek regarded the Trojan War as a conflict between Asia and Hellas, and in a line of connection with the present war. The duty of the Greeks to avenge the insult is held to be greater than any sum of money, since they will not accept the Persian commander's tempting offer of two hundred talents for himself and his children.


Thus the history of Herodotus returns to its starting-point, which is the Mythus, and specially the Mythus of Troy. (See I. 3, 4.) Protesilaus was the first man to leap on the Asiatic shore in the attack upon Troy; thus we have verily remounted to the beginning.

Typical is the fact that the cables and other

materials of the bridge were captured and taken to Athens, where they were dedicated in the temples to the Greek Gods. Such is the end of that which was to be the passage of Asia into Europe; Athens has it and will keep it, for a time at least.

The last chapter of the History is an anecdote, of the "That reminds me" style, hinting the two classes of Oriental peoples, the hardy stock of the mountains, who are the conquerors, and the effeminate inhabitants of the fertile plains, who are the conquered. It suggests also the difference between the Greek and Oriental to a certain degree. But the anecdote has been suspected to be a later addition, and it can be left away without much detriment. The History is finished when the Athenians sail home with the materials of the bridge, having captured Sestos and avenged the hero Protesilaus.







D
58
H7S6

Snider, Denton Jacques
The father of history

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

